Hierarchy and Housing in a Buddhist Monastic Code

A Translation of the Sanskrit Text of the *Śayanāsanavastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*

– Part One –

*

Gregory Schopen

– Introduction –

The *Śayanāsanavastu*, or "Section on Bedding and Seats," that is translated here is a small part of a massive collection of monastic texts called the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Significant parts of this *Vinaya* are preserved in Sanskrit among the comparatively early manuscript materials from Gilgit.[1] An "incomplete" Chinese translation by I-Ching which has been described as "mediocre" is also extant[2] — how much of this *Vinaya* I-Ching actually translated is not known, but it seems certain that a significant portion of what he did was lost after his death.[3] And what may be a "complete" version of this *Vinaya* has come down to us in Tibetan. Truth be known, however, we still do not know what would have constituted a "complete" *vinaya*[4] — we know what the Pāli *Vinaya* now contains, but it appears to lack correspondants to sections which occur in other *vinaya*s; and we know — imperfectly — what the Tibetan translation of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* contains, but, at least by Hirakawa's calculations, "it is about four times longer than other vinayas."[5] Its bulk, in fact, is impressive and one of its most immediately obvious characteristics. In the version printed at Derge, for example, it consists of the following sections and sub-sections, given in the order in which they occur:

Vinayavastu — containing seventeen individually titled *vastu*s or "sections" in four volumes: Ka of 311 folios or 622 pages; Kha of 317 folios or 634 pages; Ga of 293 folios or 586 pages; and Nga of 302 folios or 604 pages.

Prātimokṣasūtra — the first 20 folios, or forty pages, of Volume Ca.
Vinayavibhaṅga — in four volumes: Ca, folios 20-292 or 544 pages; Cha of 287 folios or 574 pages; Ja of 287 folios or, again, 574 pages; and Nya of 269 folios or 538 pages.
Bhikṣuṇīprātimokṣa — the first 25 folios, or 50 pages, of Volume Ta.
Bhikṣuṇīvinayavibhaṅga — folios 25b-328 of volume Ta, or 606 pages — the Tibetan polymath Bu-ston suggests on more than one occasion that this text is not Mūlasarvāstivādin.[6]
Vinayakṣudrakavastu — in two volumes, Tha, of 310 folios or 620 pages, and Da, of 330 folios or 660 pages.
Vinaya-uttaragrantha — in two volumes, Na, of 302 folios or 604 pages, and Pa, of 313 folios or 626 pages — there appear to be two 'works' or versions of the text here, the first incomplete; and the complete *Uttaragrantha* is made up of several discrete, named 'sections,' some of which are preserved as separate 'works' in the Chinese Canon, as S. Clark is in the process of showing.[7]

If this is a 'complete' *Vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins then that *Vinaya* in Tibetan translation amounted to 13 volumes and almost 8000 pages. Although it is only a crude approximation, some sense of the size of such a complete *Vinaya* in Sanskrit might be got by noting that Gnoli's edition of the Sanskrit text of the *Śayanāsana* printed in Roman script takes up 53 pages, and this corresponds to about 35 folios, or 70 pages, in the Derge version of the Tibetan; while Dutt's edition of the *Cīvaravastu*, which is printed in modern Devanāgari, takes up 145 pages, its Tibetan translation in the Derge print covers some 65 folios, or 130 pages. Dutt in fact has estimated that the complete *Vinayavastu*, which covers some 2446 pages in the Derge Kanjur, would have taken up in Sanskrit "about 1700 pages" of his printed Devanāgari.[8] These numbers are staggering, even by Indian standards, and it should be obvious that no matter how it is described this *Vinaya* could not have been simply a code of monastic rules.

Already very long ago Barth had rather nicely suggested that "the threefold basket [*Tripiṭaka*] of the Mūlasarvāstivādins lacked a lid and that an incessant process of osmosis operated across its partitions;"[9] and Lévi, referring more specifically to the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, has said: "it is in itself a canon that is already complete."[10] That this last is more than simply rhetoric is slowly becoming clear, and what this might mean can be seen in the fact that, for example, a significant number of the texts now found as separate *sūtra*s in the Pāli *Dīgha-*

nikāya are also found (still) embedded in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. This holds, again for example, for the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* (Pāli *Dīgha* no. 16) which occurs in the *Kṣudrakavastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*;[11] the *Śrāmaṇyaphalasūtra* (Pāli no. 2) found in the *Saṅghabhedavastu*;[12] the *Mahāsudarśanasūtra* (Pāli no.17) which occurs twice in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, once in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* and once in the *Kṣudrakavastu*;[13] the *Aggaññasutta* (Pāli no. 27), which is again found twice in the *Vinaya*, once in the *Saṅghabhedavastu* and once in the *Vibhaṅga*;[14] the *Ambāṣṭasūtra* (Pāli no. 3), also found in the *Vinaya* twice, once in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* and once in the *Kṣudrakavastu*;[15] etc. Very much the same pattern holds, moreover, for — quite literally — uncounted smaller texts that occur in other Pāli *sūtra* collections. A particularly interesting example concerns a little untitled *sūtra* which occurs in the Pāli *Aṅguttaranikāya* (ii 54-57), a *sūtra* which, to judge by the *Kathāvatthu* (VII. 5), gave Mahāvihārin scholarly monks some doctrinal trouble — it is found in full in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.[16] This same *Vinaya*, finally, also contains complete versions of other texts which are elsewhere known as separate *sūtra*s, like the *Upasenasūtra,* which occurs in the *Vinayavibhaṅga*, and the *Nagaropamasūtra*, found in the *Pravrajyāvastu*.[17]

When looked at in light of the orderly, even architectonic, arrangement of the Pāli Canon — and it is this canon more than anything else which has shaped our ideas and expectations of what a Buddhist canon and its parts should look like[18] — the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* looks decidedly messy, and one might easily think that its compilers had only a very sketchy idea of what a canon or *vinaya* should be. How we are to explain this situation is, of course, not at all clear. Sylvain Lévi had already seen the contrast, and had in fact already offered a carefully understated explanation. He said of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*: "... its tumultuous and chaotic outpouring contrasts with the dry and dull regularity of the Pāli Vinaya. But the correct and rigorous arrangement of materials, rather than the confusion of genres, marks a late stage of the art or the technique."[19] In other words, the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* might look like it does because it might represent something other than a "late stage" in the process by which Buddhist canons were formed; it might represent what a Buddhist canon looked like before it was subjected to many centuries of "rigorous" analysis, sorting, classification and arrangement. J.W. de Jong, however, seems to want to account for the character of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* in quite another way. He suggests more than once that the *Vinaya* "had finished by absorbing the substance of the *Āgama*s [or *Nikāyas*]," but has no explanation for why this should have happened.[20]

However this might eventually be worked out — and worked out it must be — it seems certain that the presence of blocks of '*sūtra*' material in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya,* sometimes in duplicate, could easily account for some of its enormous bulk. It will, though, only account for part of it, and almost certainly

not the most significant part. For that we must look at still other literary genres that it contains in abundance — one might well say, superabundance.

Oskar von Hinüber has recently said:

> "Besides material relating to Buddhist law, even the Theravāda Vinaya contains quite a few stories. In the course of the development of Vinaya texts more and more stories were incorporated, so much so that, e.g. Cullavagga VII. Saṃghabhedakkhandhaka, [The] 'Chapter on Splitting the Order,' which comprises 26 printed pages in the Theravāda version has been expanded into more than 500 pages in the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya. Thus the law texts are slowly overgrown with stories, to such an extent that there is almost a change of the literary genre, from law book to Avadāna."[21]

Von Hinüber has as usual put his finger on precisely the right point — there can be no real doubt that the presence of a very large number of "stories" accounts for much of the bulk of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya.*[22] He also offers by the choice of his language — "stories were incorporated," "law texts are slowly overgrown" — a perfectly reasonable scenario to account for how that bulk was achieved, one that dovetails nicely with de Jong's explanation for the presence of *sūtra* material in our *Vinaya*, but also shares with it the fact that no reason for why this should have happened is given. Moreover, R. Gnoli has described a situation just as reasonably in which the importance of the 'story' material is again clearly flagged, but its movement goes in quite a different direction. He has said:

> "Doubtless, as observed by Bareau, the Vinaya of the MSV [=Mūlasarvāstivādins] seems to be marked by more archaic features, not only in comparison with that of the SV [=Sarvāstivādins], but also with the major part of other Vinayapiṭaka... This Vinaya must have enjoyed a noticeable fortune also on account of its unusual literary qualities. Jātakas, avadānas, vyākaraṇas, sūtras, tales written in a style both plain and vivid, relieve the dry enumeration of the disciplinary duties, that ruled the life of the Buddhist communities. The major part of the tales of the Divyāvadāna, of the Avadānaśataka, and other works that make for edifying reading... are all of them inspired by this Vinaya, that has supplied to generations of pious compilers an inexhaustible mine..."[23]

Here, of course, the movement of "jātakas, avadānas, vyākaraṇas, sūtras, tales" is not from largely uncanonical, genre-specific collections into an authoritative, if amorphous, work, but rather from that authoritative, if still unsorted work, into ever

more genre specific separate collections. This, in turn, could be explained by at least two developments. Over time, as ever more sophisticated and analytical editorial procedures were applied to the accumulated mass of authoritative materials, and the sense of separate genres came to be increasingly felt, texts of related types would have been peeled off that previously unsorted mass and grouped together to form separate collections of specific genres. Over time, as the accumulated mass of authoritative materials increased in size there would have been an increasing need for smaller, usable handbooks or collections. These two factors could easily have functioned in tandem, and seen in the light of this scenario the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* might indeed be described as "in itself a canon that is already complete" — again, a very primitive one, one that was never completely subjected to the editorial procedures that eventually produced, for example, the Pāli Canon.[24]

These are, indeed, very big questions and cannot be further entertained here; though eventually entertained they, again, must be. Ironically, however, regardless of which developmental scenario comes to be established one important point seems clear: either *jātakas*, *avadānas* and 'tales' were, from the beginning, overwhelmingly considered to be monastic forms of literature intended for monks, or they came increasingly to be so considered over time, at least in the Mūlasarvāstivādin case. Such conclusions seem unavoidable since a truly large proportion of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* as we have it — regardless of how it got that way — is made up of just such texts, and it, most definitely, was intended for monks.

The monastic character of *jātaka* and *avadāna* literature has rarely been suggested by modern scholars, and never quite as adroitly as by Phyllis Granoff. She first says:

> "While little is actually known about the growth and circulation of the *avadānas*, the texts themselves tell us that they are stories that were related by the Buddha to his monks. There is no question that the stories post-date the lifetime of the Buddha; on the other hand, there is less reason to doubt their claim that they were meant for circulation within the Buddhist monastic community itself."

To this she adds the following note:

> "In some cases, but not in all, this seems obvious from the subject matter or tone of the stories. Thus we have stories told to illustrate why a monk should not store food or to explain why reverence, should be paid to elders in the community. Many stories are decidedly misogynistic in tone, which would also be in keeping with their being told to monks.

> There are multiple versions of the story of the monk who cannot break his ties with his family and returns home, only to be reclaimed by the Buddha for the monastic community, a theme particularly appropriate in a monastic setting. Scholars have tended to see in the *avadānas* and *jātakas* examples of popular preaching for the masses and have seen these two related types of literature as distinctly non-monastic, and suited for the laity... The texts themselves have a different story to tell, and do not necessarily support the standard scholarly assessment of monks as learned as opposed to an illiterate lay population... There is thus good reason to accept the evidence of the stories themselves and to regard them as part of the teaching offered to monks. This would also be consistent with the parallels we see between the *avadānas* and the various *vinaya* stories, which were undoubtedly addressed to the monks."[25]

Much almost certainly could be added here that would both confirm and extend Granoff's observations, but that must wait. For the moment her remarks will suffice to indicate that a good — and perhaps definitive — case can be made for the monastic character and audience of *avadāna* and *jātaka* literature, a case which would support the distinct likelihood that just as average monks in medieval European monasteries did not read learned theological tomes, but *Lives of the Saints* that carried and confirmed monastic rules and values, average Buddhist monks in early and medieval India typically read *avadānas* and *jātakas* that did the same for them.

All of what has been said so far is relevant to the *Śayanāsanavastu* that is translated here because — being in most regards representative of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* as a whole — more than half of it is made up of *jātakas*, *avadānas* and tales. Indeed almost all of the first half of the text is so constituted. Very near the beginning a version of "The Jātaka of the Partridge" occurs — this is almost certainly the same text that Granoff alludes to when she refers to a story "told to ... explain why reverence should be paid to elders in the community." This in turn is shortly followed by a long story about the founding of the Jetavana Monastery by the householder Anāthapiṇḍada, which itself contains several stories of his former births. In fact it is only in the second half of the text — which will be published in the second installment of this work — that we get extended strings of monastic rules delivered, and even here there are tales, like the story of a past life of the monk Upananda as a greedy dog. This structure is something of a pattern in regard to the more elaborate *vastus* of this *Vinaya* — it holds as well for both the *Cīvara-* and *Bhaiṣajya-vastus*, for example. Given this significant place of *jātakas*, *avadānas* and stories in our *Vinaya*, and given that all three have every right to be classified as genres of Indian literature, it would seem that the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-*

vinaya must be described, in part at least, as a work of literature — it is as much that as it is a monastic code. Once again, Sylvain Lévi recognized this a long time ago.

Lévi not only considered the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* as a work of literature, he seems to have considered it good literature — in fact he calls it "one of the masterpieces of Sanskrit literature" ("un des chefs-d'oeuvre de la littérature sanscrite");[26] describes it as "written with art;" and says "the prescriptions often appear to simply be pretexts to tell at length familiar stories — heroic, comic, fabulous and romantic."[27] I have tried in fact to reflect at least some of this both in the tone of the translation and in the headings I have added to the sections into which I have divided the text.[28] Perhaps even more important here, however, is what Lévi says in comparing our *Vinaya* to another master-work of Indian story literature: "The Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādins is," he says, "a kind of Bṛhatkathā for the usage of monks,"[29] and here we strike a final point that needs to be drawn out.

As Sternbach has so clearly shown in regard to the *Pañcatantra,* one of the characteristics of Indian story literature is that many of its tales are informed by, turn on, or reflect juridical problems or points of law[30] — this much alone is perhaps sufficient to call into question at least the significance of the shift "from law book to Avadāna" that von Hinüber saw in the development of the *Vinaya*: it may have been only a shift — if shift it was — in how rules were delivered, or a shift in style, not in purpose.[31] But Sternbach also noted — again in regard to the *Pañcatantra* — another point that appears to be particularly germane to the *Śayanāsanavastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, especially to its long and sometimes obscure account of the founding of the Jetavana. Sternbach has said:

> "We know that various versions of the Pañcatantra exist in which some of the tales, especially those which have something in common with law, were narrated in different ways. Some of them were in conformity with the rules contained in the *Smṛti*-s, and others were not. In particular, later texts, the longer versions (*textus ornatior*), tried to make the text conform to the legal rules in order to eliminate illogical passages which might shock the reader or listener."[32]

But if the redactors of "the longer versions" of the *Pañcatantra* were in fact sometimes trying to 'normalize' their tales and bring them into line with established legal norms and expectations, there are some indications that the redactors of our *Śayanāsanavastu* may well have been engaged in a similar process. They go out of their way to explain, for example, how as a child Anāthapiṇḍada could give away what in effect was family property when Indian law was very clear that a minor, or

a son whose father was still alive, could not enter independently into any sort of valid transaction involving property.[33] Given this kind of demonstrated sensitivity to legal issues involving minors on their part, it seems very unlikely that our redactors would not have noticed, or could have ignored, an even more serious legal problem in the received accounts of Anāthapiṇḍada's purchase of the land for the Jetavana: since Anāthapiṇḍada was said to have bought it from a prince, or boy, whose father was still living, the sale — by *dharmaśāstric* law or expectation — would have been highly illegal. Although there is, of course, no way of definitively demonstrating this, a certain embarrassment in regard to the received account, and a desire to recast it in a more acceptable form, or — at the very least — to obscure or blur the sharp edges of the observable illegality, could certainly account for the curious and possibly intentional ambiguities that occur in the account that we now find in the *Śayanāsanavastu*.[34] If nothing else, however, all of this might at least alert the reader to the possibility that Buddhist stories and *Avadānas* — like *Pañcatantra* tales — might well be far more sophisticated than they appear at first sight to be, and that, in effect, these stories are not simply tales.

* * *

This is, of course, not the place for an extended discussion of either the date or place of origin of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Such a discussion may not in fact be either required, nor at this point even fruitful. There is a broad consensus — but only that — that this *Vinaya* must have been redacted in the Northwest, the area between and including Gandhara and Mathura, and much of its contents would support this. There is also now a general consensus that this redaction must have occurred in the Kuṣān period, and that Lamotte's assertion that it can only be dated rather late — no earlier than the 4th or 5th centuries of the Common Era — was very much a red herring. As has already been pointed out elsewhere, Lamotte himself came to recognize this without, unfortunately, explicitly saying so.[35]

There can be, moreover, very little doubt about the influence of this *Vinaya* over time. It was — as already noted by Gnoli — heavily drawn on by the compilers of both the *Avadānaśataka* and the *Divyāvadāna*; the author of *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, who Lamotte thinks "certainly lived at the time of the Great Kusāṇas," also drew heavily on it, especially in regard to the numerous *avadānas* and *jātakas* that he cites or alludes to;[36] still later it was — as Schlingloff has shown — a major source of inspiration for the artists who covered the walls of the monasteries at Ajanta with paintings.[37] It was, to judge by I-Ching's travel account, perhaps the *Vinaya* of choice in his day at both Nālanda and Tāmralipti,[38] and was almost certainly so in the Buddhist communities in Eastern India from which the Tibetans got their traditions. Manuscripts containing it have been found

— usually in fragments — at Gilgit, Turfan, and now, it seems, among the Schøyen collection from around Bamiyan.[39] Its influence seems to have reached Sri Lanka and perhaps even Burma.[40] Looked at from almost any angle the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* emerges as a major work of Indian Buddhism, one whose importance may actually have almost matched its size.

* * *

The fact that the *Śayanāsanavastu* is in structure and content representative of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* as a whole — about half of it is made up of *jātaka*s, *avadāna*s and tales, the other half of more formally delivered monastic rules — makes it, perhaps, an ideal candidate for translation. So too does the fact that although it is similar to the *Cīvara-, Bhaiṣajya-,* and *Saṅghabheda-vastu*s, it is considerably shorter than any of these. But these and other advantages might well be off-set by other factors. The manuscript on which our Sanskrit text is based, for example, is far, far older than anything we have for the Pāli *Vinaya*, but it is also a single manuscript, which in part at least has had to be pieced together,[41] and even the best single manuscript is never entirely reliable or problem free. Gnoli's edition — when it can be checked — is also not free of problems, and it can only be checked against the facsimile for about the first third of the text: the whereabouts of the original manuscripts that were in Italy are no longer entirely clear.[42] There is a Tibetan translation of the *Śayanāsana* which, as usual, is generally of great help. It is, however, clear that the Sanskrit text on which it is based differed somewhat, and sometimes, from the text we have from Gilgit. All of this has meant that the translation would have to be accompanied with a good number of purely textual notes. In an attempt to distinguish these purely textual notes from other notes — also added in good number — that *might* be of some use for an appreciation of the contents of the text, and of interest to a broader readership, I have printed the numbers for the first type of note in normal type-face, and those for the second in bold. Since some of the notes actually contain material of both kinds, when this occurred — when a textual note, for example, also contained material of a more general sort — its number too is printed in bold. Occasionally it was difficult to decide which category a given note should be included in, and my choices may sometimes appear, alas, to be inconsistent.

* * *

I am grateful to Jan Nattier for reading this work carefully and making a number of suggestions which improved it. I am also grateful to Phyllis Granoff —

who I later found out acted as one of the readers for the Journal — for more of the same.

The Section on Bedding and Seats[1]

I. *Dealing With Competing Claims For Status and First Access to Material Goods —*

The Buddha, the Blesssed One, was staying in Śrāvastī in the Jetavana, in the Park of Anāthapiṇḍada.

On that occasion a large group of monks who were assembled and seated in the service hall[2] had a discussion and conversation of this sort: "Venerables, whom must we honor, revere, respect and venerate? To whom must we perform the acts of salutation, deferential greeting, rising, the gesture of supplication and paying respect? Who among us is entitled to use[3] the first seat, the first water, the first alms?"

Some there spoke in this way: "A member of the Buddha's clan[4] who has entered into the religious life.[5]"

But others said: "A member of the priestly caste who has entered into the religious life."

Some said: "A member of the ruling caste who has entered into the religious life." Some: "A member of the productive caste who has entered into the religious life." Some: "A member of the serving caste who has entered into the religious life."

Still others said: "One who has entered into the religious life from an elevated family without blemish," or "one who has entered into the religious life from a wealthy family free of want."

Some said: "One who is handsome, a delight to see, lovely.[6]"

"One of cultivated speech, possessed of verbal skill.[7]"

"One who is famous and of great fortune.[8]"

"One who preserves the *sūtra*, or preserves the *vinaya,* or preserves the summary. One who is learned, or an expounder of Dharma."

"A Royal Elder.[9]"

"A forest dweller, or one who limits himself to three robes, or wears felt, or wears rag robes, or a mendicant, or one who always uses the same seat, or who does not eat after the proper time, or who lives at the root of a tree, or who lives in a cemetery, or who lives in the open, or who sleeps sitting up, or one who accepts any seat that is offered.[10]"

"One who obtains the perception of the impermanent...and as before, up to...:[11] One who is an Arhat absorbed in the eight meditative releases."

But some said: "Among us all, Venerables, there is no agreement precisely because of the multiplicity of our designations.[12] Come![13] We are going to go to the Blessed One. Having done so we will ask the Blessed One about this matter. However the Blessed One will determine it for us, just so will we keep to it."

That large group of monks went then to the Blessed One. When they had arrived and had shown deference to his feet with their heads they sat down at one end of the assembly. Seated there, that large group of monks said to the Blessed One "Just now (4), Reverend One, a large group of monks who were assembled and seated in the service hall had a discussion and conversation of this sort: '...and as before, up to...: However the Blessed One will determine it for us, just so will we keep to it.' We, the very ones, ask the Blessed One about this matter: who must we honor, revere, respect and venerate:...and as before, up to...: who is entitled to use the first alms?"

The Blessed One said: "You, monks, must honor, revere, respect and venerate the more senior. To that one you must perform the acts of salutation, deferential greeting, rising, the gesture of supplication and paying respects. And that one among you is entitled to the first seat, the first water, the first alms."

When the Blessed One had said "You, monks, must honor...the more senior[14]...and as before, up to...: that one is entitled to use...the first alms,[15]" the monks honored, revered, respected and venerated lay men[16] who were senior. But when brahmins and householders[17] heard about that they were contemptuous, dismissive, and spoke disparagingly: "We, Noble Ones, enjoy the sensual pleasures, are sunk in the mud of sensual pleasure, and yet you honor us?"

The monks reported this matter to the Blessed One. The Blessed One said: "Monks, what I said referred to those who have entered into the religious life, but not to lay men."

When the monks saw members of other religious groups[18] who were senior they honored, revered, respected, and venerated them. The Blessed One said: "What I said referred to those belonging to this Dharma,[19] but not to outsiders."

When they saw novices who had entered into the religious life when they were seniors they honored, revered, respected and venerated them. The Blessed One said: "What I said, monks, referred to those who are ordained, but not to novices."

They honored, revered, respected and venerated seniors who were newly ordained. The Blessed One said: "Deference[20] must be shown only after having asked about each others' first year."

But when they were being asked they gave their year of birth. Then the Blessed One said: "The first year of ordination must be asked for!"

But the monks did not know how to ask.[21] The Blessed One said: "They must be made to declare the seasonal period!"[22]

But the monks did not know what the seasonal periods[21] were. The Blessed One said: "There are, monks, five periods: winter, summer, the rainy season, the short rains, and the long rains. Winter then is four months; summer is four months; the rainy season is one month; the short rains are one day and night; the long rains are three months minus one night.[23] When the seasonal period has been declared accordingly, deference must be shown to the one who was ordained earlier!"

"Monks, deference must be shown to four others. To which four must deference be shown? (5) The world together with its gods, Māra and Brahmā, all creatures[24] including śramaṇas and brahmins, gods and men, must show deference to a Tathāgata, Arhat, Fully and Completely Awakened Buddha.[25] All lay men[26] must show deference to one who has entered into the religious life. All those who are ordained must show deference to one who was ordained earlier, except in the case of a nun: she--even if ordained for a hundred years--must show deference to a monk who has just been ordained that day![27] Anyone who is unordained[28] must also show deference to one who is ordained!

"Ten must not be shown deference. Which ten? One who is on probation; one whose probation has had to start over; one who has undergone probation; one who is undergoing the procedure for becoming agreeable again; one who is suspended for not seeing a fault; one who is suspended for not correcting a fault; one who is suspended when reprehensible views are not abandoned;[29] he who is a lay man; and one who is not ordained."[30]

When the Blessed One had set them in order according to the principle of seniority the monks then honored, revered, respected, and venerated each other, and while honoring, revering,[31] respecting and venerating each other they grew in good qualities like a lotus in water. But the monks, experiencing some uncertainty, asked He who Cuts off All Uncertainty, the Buddha, the Blessed One:[32] "Look, Reverend One, how when the Blessed One has ordered them according to the principle of seniority the monks then honor, revere, respect and venerate each other, and while honoring, revering, respecting and venerating each other they grow in good qualities like a lotus in water!"

The Blessed One said, "But, monks, now that I am devoid of passion, hatred and delusion, am fully freed from birth, old age, illness, death, sorrow, lamentation, suffering, despair and anguish, am all knowing, have knowledge of every aspect, and have mastered what should be known by one who knows all, is there really anything remarkable in the fact that when I have set in order the principle of seniority, and when they have recourse to the principle of seniority, the monks honor, revere,...each other...and as before, up to...: like a lotus in water?[33] But listen, rather, to an account of how when I was by no means devoid of passion, hatred and delusion, was not freed from birth, old age, illness, death, sorrow, lamentation, suffering, despair and anguish, and had fallen in bodily form,[34] I set in

order the principle of seniority and, having recourse to it, all creatures living on the Indian Continent were for the most part reborn among the excellent gods of the heaven of the thirty-three!"

II. *A Prehistory for the Principle of Monastic Seniority: The Jātaka of the Partridge* [1] —

In a time long ago, monks, four animals were living in a dense forest in the countryside of Kāśi: a partridge, a rabbit, a monkey, and an elephant.[2] (6) They, established in friendship, united, harmonious, congenial, without dispute and secure, spent their time living as they pleased until on one occasion the idea occurred to them: "But we do not know who we must honor, revere, respect and venerate. What if we were to order things according to the principle of seniority?"[3] They began to talk among themselves, saying "who among us is the senior?"

The partridge then showed them a Banyan tree. "Sirs," he said, "what size was the Banyan tree when first seen by each?"

The elephant said: "When I was going along this path with the herd and first saw it it was no bigger than I in height."

But the monkey said: "When I was going along this path with the troop and saw it it was also the same size as I in height."

They said to the monkey, "You are his senior."

Then the rabbit said, "With my tongue I was even able to lick the drops of dew off its two leaves when this was just a shoot.[4]

"You," they said to the rabbit, "are the senior of both."

The partridge then spoke: "Look at that other huge Banyan tree over there!"

"We see it," they said.

"After I had eaten some fruit from it I left some droppings on this spot. From that this Banyan that you are asking about grew."

They said: "If that is so, you are the senior of all of us.[5]" The elephant then began to honor all of them;[5] the monkey honored the rabbit and the partridge; the rabbit honored only the partridge. Showing honor thus according to seniority they wandered around here and there in that thick forest. When they had to go through rough or deep places the monkey then mounted the elephant, the rabbit got on the monkey, and the partridge then perched on him.

When they had increased even more in mutual fondness and were always respectful this thought occurred to them: "We, sirs, have increased further in mutual fondness and are always respectful, but there is some other good which, when we have taken it up, we should pursue. What are we going to do?"

The partridge said: "We are going to stop taking life."

"But in what way do we take life?"

The partridge said, "There are grasses and flowers and fruits that have living things, and there are those that are free of living things.[6] From now on, having given up those that have living things, we must eat those that are free of them."

They then gave up those that had living things and began to eat those that did not.

This also occurred to them: "We have stopped taking life, but should we not stop taking what was not given.[7]"

"But in what way do we take what is not given?"

The partridge said: "There are grasses and leafs and flowers and fruits that are fenced, and there are those which are unfenced.[8] From now on, having given up those that are fenced, we must only eat those that are unfenced. (7)

They then gave up those that were fenced and began to eat those that were not.

This too occurred to them: "We have stopped taking what was not given, but not improper sexual conduct.[9] But of what sort is our improper sexual conduct?"

The partridge said: "We go to both licit mates and to illicit mates.[10] From now on then we must go to a licit mate, not an illicit one." And they went to a licit mate, not an illicit one.

This also occurred to them: "We have stopped improper sexual conduct, but not mindless talk.[11] What if we were to stop mindless talk. But of what sort is our mindless talk?"

The partridge said: "We just prattle about this or that. From now on then we must not prattle about this or that. Rather we must speak at the proper time after having repeatedly considered it!" And they no longer prattled about this or that, but rather spoke at the proper time only after repeatedly considering it.

And this also occurred to them: "We have stopped mindless talk, but not getting intoxicated on intoxicating liquor and drink. What if we were to stop getting intoxicated on intoxicating liquor and drink.[12] But of what sort is our intoxication?"

The partridge said: "There are intoxicating fruits, and there are nonintoxicating ones. From now on then we, having given up intoxicating fruits, must eat those that are not!"

When they had been established in these five religious observances[13] the partridge then said: "We, sirs, are established in these five religious observances, but what if we were to also establish others in them?"[14]

"We should do so."

"But who among you will do it?"

The monkey said: "I will establish all the animals who live among the branches."

Then the rabbit said: "And I will establish all rabbits and fur bearing animals."

"I," said the elephant, "will establish all elephants, lions, tigers and leopards."

The partridge said: "If that is so, then, in brief,[15] those which are not disciplined[16] by you, whether footless, or two-footed, or four-footed, or winged--all of those I will establish in these five religious observances."

(8) They then established in these five religious observances all those living things belonging to the animal kingdom in the region of Kāśi. Those animals lived in the forest as they wished in mutual kindness and were always considerate.[17] Through their powerful effect[18] the god who brings the rains at the proper time came--the trees always had flowers and fruits and the earth grains.

Men saw the animals living in mutual kindness, the trees always with flowers and fruits, and the earth always with grain. The King said, "I govern with righteousness--this is my powerful effect." But the queens, the princes, ministers, the army, the townsmen and country people all said: "This is our powerful effect."[19] The King thought to himself: "Everybody says 'this is my effect, this is my effect,' but just whose powerful effect it is is not known." His curiosity aroused, he sent for those who read signs[20] and asked them, but even they did not know.

There was then a garden not very far from Vārāṇasī. A Ṛsi who had the five kinds of supernatural knowledge lived there and was venerated, respected and approached with reverence by all the people who lived in Vārāṇasī. The King went to that Ṛsi, fell at his feet, and said: "All of the living things in the animal kingdom, Great Ṛsi, live as they wish in my country with mutual kindness and consideration, the god brings rain, the trees are always in flower and fruit and the earth with grain. I therefore thought: "I govern with righteousness--this is my powerful effect.' But the queens, the princes and ministers, the army and townsmen and country people also thought: 'This is our effect.' Whose powerful effect it is is not actually known. I have become very curious and you are able to cut off the uncertainty. Whose powerful effect is this?"

The Ṛsi said: "This is not your powerful effect, Great King, nor that of the queens or princes or ministers or the army, townsmen or country people. But there are four animals living in your country--this is their powerful effect."

The King said: "I am going to go and see them."

"But, Great King," the Ṛsi said, "what is there for you in seeing them? You should rather undertake and pursue that which they have undertaken and pursued."[21]

"And what have they undertaken and pursued?"

"Five religious observances."

"Of what sort, Great Ṛsi, are those five religious observances?"

"Great King, they do not deprive a living thing of life. They do not carry off the property of others. They do not go to illicit mates. They do not engage in mindless talk. And they do not use intoxicating drinks."

The King said: "If that is so, Great Ṛsi, I too am going to undertake and pursue these five religious observances." And that King undertook those five observances and began to pursue them. His queens, saying "The King has undertaken and pursues these five religious observances," did likewise. And the princes, ministers, army, townsmen and country people also undertook and began to pursue the five observances. (9) Even lesser kings of neighboring regions heard that King Brahmadatta[22] together with his queens, princes, ministers, army, townsmen and country people had undertaken and were pursuing the five religious observances, and when they heard that they too, together with their queens, princes, ministers, armies, townsmen and country people, also undertook and began to pursue them. Indeed, for the most part everyone undertook the five religious observances and began to pursue them.

Anyone who died then on the Indian continent was, after the destruction of the body,[23] reborn among the excellent gods of the heaven of the thirty-three. When Śakra, the leader of the Gods, saw the divine assembly becoming full he spoke this verse:[24]

> They dwell reverential and respectful in a
> forest of religious exercises,[25]
> but the religious life of a partridge[26] has
> made itself apparent in a different world.

The Blessed One said: "What do you think, monks?" That one who was the partridge--I indeed was he at that time, on that occasion. The rabbit was the Monk Śāriputra, the monkey was the Monk Maudgalyāyana, Ānanda was the elephant. Then too when I had set in order the principle of seniority, and they had recourse to the principle of seniority, all inhabitants of the Indian continent were for the most part reborn among the gods of the thirty-three. Now too when I have set in order the principle of seniority and the monks, having recourse to it, are honoring, revering, respecting and venerating each other, they grow in good qualities like a lotus in water."[27]

"You, monks, must therefore live now with reverence, respect, and the mastery of apprehension[28] in regard to fellow-monks,[29] elders, those of middle rank and new monks.[30] And why? It is not possible, monks, that a monk will fulfill the rules of customary behavior[31] so long as he continues to live without reverence, respect, and the mastery of apprehension in regard to elders, those of middle rank, and new monks. It is not possible that he will fulfill the rules of

training[32] when he has not fulfilled the rules of customary behavior. It is not possible that he will fulfill the collections[33] of moral action, of concentration, of wisdom, of the meditative releases,[34] and of the knowledge and vision of the meditative releases, when he has not fulfilled the rules of training. And it is not possible that he, being free of attachment, will achieve final nirvāna, when he has not fulfilled the collection of the knowledge and vision of the meditative releases. (10)

"It is, however, possible,[35] monks, that a monk will fulfill the rules of customary behavior so long as he continues to live with reverence, respect, and the mastery of any apprehension in regard to fellow-monks, elders, those of middle rank, and new monks. It is possible that he will fulfill the rules of training when he has fulfilled the rules of customary behavior. It is possible that he will fulfill the collections of moral action, of concentration, of wisdom, of the meditative releases and of the knowledge and vision of the meditative releases when he has fulfilled the rules of training. It is possible that he, being free of attachment, will achieve final nirvāna when he has fulfilled the collection of the knowledge and vision of the meditative releases."

"Therefore, monks, one must train now in this way: 'We then will live with reverence, with respect and mastery of any apprehension in regard to fellow-monks, elders, those of middle rank, and new monks!'"

"In this way, monks, must you train!"[36]

III. *Dealing with the Housing Problem and the Origin of Vihāras* —

When the Blessed One had trained the first five monks they lived in the forest, but while living there they were vulnerable to lions, tigers, leopards and hyenas.[1] The Blessed One then thought to himself: "Where have the disciples of past Fully and Completely Awakened Buddhas made their home?" He saw that it was in a *vihāra*.[2] The gods also told the Blessed One that it was so.[3]

At that time there was a householder named Kalyāṇabhadra[4] living in Vārāṇasī. This idea occurred to him since his disposition was enlivened by his roots of good:[5] "I, indeed, should have a *vihāra* built for the disciples of the Blessed One!" He got up at day-break and went to the Blessed One. When he had arrived and had shown deference with his head to the feet of the Blessed One, he sat down at one end of the assembly. While he was seated at one end of the assembly the Blessed One, through talk about Dharma, led the householder Kalyāṇabhadra to see. He inspired, incited and delighted him. When he had led him to see through various sorts of talk about Dharma, had inspired, incited and delighted him, the Blessed One was silent.

Then the householder Kalyāṇabhadra got up from his seat, put his upper-robe over one shoulder, made the gesture of supplication to the Blessed One, and said to him: "If the Blessed One were to order[6] it I would have a *vihāra* built for the disciples of the Blessed One."

The Blessed One said: "Therefore, householder, I order[6] it. Have one built!"

But Kalyāṇabhadra did not know what sort he should have built.

The Blessed One said: "If you have one with three cells[7] built the Perfume Chamber[8] must be built in the middle, the two other cells on each side. It is the same for one with three sides and nine cells. In a four-sided one the Perfume Chamber is in the middle of the far wall facing the entrance hall[9] (11) and there are two cells, one on each side of that entrance!"

He did not know how many levels must be built.

The Blessed One said: "For monks a *vihāra* must be built with five levels,[10] a Perfume Chamber with seven levels, a summer room over the entrance[11] with seven. But for nuns a *vihāra* must be built with three levels, a Perfume Chamber with five, and a summer room over the entrance with five!"[12]

IV. *The Biography of Anāthapiṇḍada and Building the Jetavana:*[1]
Anāthapiṇḍada's Early Life —

At that time a householder named Datta was living in Śrāvastī. He was rich, had great wealth, many possessions, wide and extensive holdings. He approached Vaiśravaṇa in wealth, rivaled Vaiśravaṇa in wealth. He took a wife from a family of the same sort. He played, enjoyed himself and made love with her. In time, while playing, enjoying himself and making love, his wife became pregnant.[2] After eight or nine months she gave birth and a son was born. After the birth festival had been performed in detail for three times seven or twenty-one days, he was given a name. "What must this boy's name be?," it was asked.

His relatives said: "This boy is the son of the householder Datta. Therefore he should be named Sudatta." And so the name Sudatta was given to him.

The boy Sudatta was given eight nurses--two to carry him around, two to breast feed him, two to change him, and two to play with him. Those eight nurses brought him up, and he thrived on milk, thickened milk, fresh and clarified butter, butter scum, and a variety of other refined foods--quickly he grew, like a night-closing lotus in pool.[3] Once he was sitting outside in the arms of his nurse wearing all his ornaments. A beggar asked him for one: "Young sir, I would like an ornament--could you give me one?"

Sudatta was delighted and gave him that ornament. When he was back inside the house his father asked the nurse: "Where is the boy's ornament?"

The nurse said: "The boy gave it (12) to a beggar."

Datta adorned him with another ornament--he gave it away too. And when he once again was adorned, that also he gave away. Datta then said to his wife: "A fine son we have, my Dear--He is always giving things away!"[4]

"If that is so, Noble Son," she said, "I will just not adorn him anymore."

"We have, my Dear, lots of gold and precious things but hardly pots of ornaments--just don't put him outside anymore." And Sudatta had to play indoors.

Once, though, the householder Datta[5] was going to bathe in the Ajīravatī River with his servants, and the boy Sudatta said: "Father, I want to go too!"

Datta tried to cajole him: "But, son, there is lovely water right here, and the river is full of hungry monsters.[6] The nurse will give you a bath."

But he began to cry and his mother said: "Why, sir, is this boy howling?"

He explained what had happened and she said: "Sir, let him go with you! What's the problem here? He will be much safer with you!"

Datta took him and went to the river. When he had bathed and was back on the bank Sudatta said: "Father, why am I always watched?"

"Because you, son, have a fault.[7]"

"How?"[8]

"Any ornament you are given you hand over to some beggar."

"But, father, do you want things?"

"Who doesn't, son?"[9]

"If that is so, Father, then put me down."

His father put him down and Sudatta plunged both hands into the river and brought up four copper pots filled with gold. "Father," he said, "when you have used as much as you want of this wealth then just throw the rest back into the river!"

"Can you, son, see hoards that are in water?"

"Not just in water, Father, but also those in the ground, whether they have an owner or not, and those also which are far away or near."

The householder Datta, his eyes wide with amazement, thought to himself: "Such a lord of wealth[10] is certainly able[11] to give gifts." Knowing this he said: "If that is so, son, you must make gifts as you please!"[12]

V. *Anāthapiṇḍada Reaches His Majority, and Makes a Name for Himself —*

> *--This, indeed, is the established rule: "A son does not have his own worth so long as his father lives"--*[1]

Later when the householder Datta died and Sudatta had become the owner of the house[2] he constantly gave alms to the lordless. Everywhere it was heard: "Sudatta, the son of the householder Datta, has become the owner of the house.

(13) He, to the lordless (*anātha*), gives alms (*piṇḍaka*)," and he came to be called "The householder Anāthapiṇḍada."

The householder Anāthapiṇḍada then took a wife from a family of the same sort. He played, enjoyed himself and made love with her. While playing, enjoying himself and making love a son was born.[3] In the same way seven sons were born. He made marriages for six of them and was looking about for the same sort of family for the seventh, whose name was Sujāta. But he met with none and sat dejected, cheek on hand.[4]

A young brahmin named Madhuskandha was a friend of his. He saw that Anāthapiṇḍada was dejected and said: "Why, householder, are you sitting here dejected, cheek in hand?"

Anāthapiṇḍada said: "I have made marriages for six of my sons, but now I am thinking about the same sort of family for Sujāta, the seventh--with what family can I make a marriage for him?"

Madhuskandha said: "You must not worry! I will go in search of such a family for him."

"But where?"

"I will go as far as the region of Magadha," he said.

"Yes. Do!"

Madhuskandha went to Rājagṛha. There was in fact a householder in Rājagṛha who was rich, had great wealth, many possessions and was very much like Anāthapiṇḍada. Madhuskandha entered his house and standing in the entrance hall said: "Be well, be well!"[5]

The people of the house said, "But, brahmin, what do you want?"

"To beg for a marriageable girl."

"For whom?"

"The householder Anāthapiṇḍada in Śrāvastī--his son named Sujāta."

They said: "That is the same sort of family as ours, but we also must have a substantial bride-price."[6]

"How substantial?"

[7]"A hundred horses, a hundred gold niṣkas,[8] a hundred mule carts, and a hundred kāmbojika girls."

The young brahmin Madhuskandha sent a letter to that effect to the householder Anāthapiṇḍada. When the latter had read it he too sent a return letter[9] saying, "Accept it! I will give all of that." And he immediately agreed and accepted.

The household then regaled him with pure, fine and abundant food. But when he went to a hostel for young brahmins[10] to stay he experienced vomiting and diarrhea[11] and, the brahmins there being unacquainted with him,[12] from fear of pollution[13] threw him out and abandoned him.[14] By fate[15] the Venerables

Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana had come to that place and saw him. Both of them cleaned him with a bamboo brush, rubbed him with white earth and bathed him,[16] and when they had taught Dharma to him[17] they departed. But his diarrhea did not abate and, with a mind deeply moved[18] in regard to the two monks, he died. He was reborn among the Gods of the Four Great Kings and went to the Great King Vaiśravaṇa to ask for a mansion.[19] Vaiśravaṇa said: "Go! The funereal gate[20] is your mansion."

He went there and became its resident.

(14) At that time the King of Videha had presented a hundred Himalayan elephants to King Biṃbisāra, and he in turn had sent word to Prasenajit of Kośala saying: "The King of Videha has sent me a hundred Himalayan elephants. If you want them you should have them brought to you!"[21]

The Householder Anāthapiṇḍada had gone to King Prasenajit of Kośala, and when he had arrived he said this to him: "Lord, I have something to do in Rājagṛha, but having gone there I will return."

The King said: "Very good. Go! I have a hundred elephants that must be brought from there. Will you bring them back?"

Anāthapiṇḍada said: "Since, Lord, I have something to do there anyway[22] I will get them and, when returning, I can in this case fulfill the Lord's wish."

The King said: "Very good. Do so!"

VI. *Anāthapiṇḍada Sees the Light and Meets the Buddha —*

The householder Anāthapiṇḍada then took that substantial bride-price and went to Rājagṛha. The Householder in whose house he stayed got up[1] while it was still dark and called out to his household: "Get up, Noble Ones, get up! Split the wood, sirs! Light the fire! Cook the food! Cook the sauce! Toss the cakes![2] Prepare the courtyard![3]" The Householder Anāthapiṇḍada began to wonder: "Will this householder be taking a wife or giving a daughter in marriage? Has he invited the whole country to this meal, or a guild or an association or an assembly? Maybe he has invited the King of Magadha, Śrenya Biṃbisāra, to a meal?" So thinking he said to that householder: "Will you, householder, be taking a wife or giving a daughter? Or have you invited the whole country to a meal, or a guild or an association or an assembly? Or have you invited the King of Magadha, Śrenya Biṃbisāra, to a meal?"

He said: "I will not be taking a wife, householder, nor giving a daughter. Nor have I invited the whole country to a meal, nor a guild or association or assembly; nor have I invited the King of Magadha, Śrenya Biṃbisāra, to a meal. Rather, the community of monks headed by the Buddha has been invited to a meal."

When the householder Anāthapiṇḍada heard the sound of the word "Buddha," which he had not heard before, all of his hair stood on end. His hair on end, Anāthapiṇḍada said this to that householder: "But who, householder, is this one who is called Buddha?"

"He is the Śramaṇa Gautama, householder (15), a son of the Śākyas, from the Śākya clan, who cut off his hair and beard, put on yellow robes and, with full faith, went from the home[4] to homelessness and the religious life. He fully and completely awakened to unsurpassed, full and complete awakening. He is the one, householder, called the Buddha."

"And what is this called the Community?"

"There are, householder, sons of good family from families of the ruling caste who have cut their hair and beards, put on yellow robes and, with full faith, have followed into the religious life that same Blessed One who had entered into the religious life. Sons of good family from families of the priestly caste, the productive caste and the serving caste as well have cut off their hair and beards, put on yellow robes and, with full faith, followed into the religious life that same one who had entered into the religious life, leaving home for homelessness.[5] That is what is called the Community. That community of monks headed by the Buddha has been invited by me for a meal tomorrow[6] in my inner rooms."

"But, householder, where is that Blessed One staying now?"

"Right here in Rājagṛha, in the Śītavana Charnel Grounds.[7]"

"Are we permitted to get sight of this Blessed One?"[8]

"For that, indeed, you, householder, must wait a while. You will have the opportunity to see him right here tomorrow."

That night the householder Anāthapiṇḍada went to sleep with his thoughts focused on the Buddha.[9] While it was still night, thinking it was light out when it wasn't, he went to the funereal gate.[10] At that time the funereal gate, during two watches of the night,[11] the first and the last,[12] was left open, it being said: "Let there be no hindrance to visitors, travelers and messengers." When he saw the funereal gate open and suffused with light[13] it occurred to him: "It is surely morning since the funereal gate stands open."[14] Having thought that he went out of the city by that same light. But as soon as he had gone out that light disappeared and it was dark. Anāthapiṇḍada was afraid, in a state of terror, his hair bristling, saying: "Surely someone--human, non-human, or criminal--will do me harm, or that substantial bride-price go astray?" So thinking, and wanting to turn back, he circumambulated and paid honor to the residential ground[15] of the son of the gods Madhuskandha.

Then this occurred to the son of the god Madhuskandha: "Now, for sure, the householder Anāthapiṇḍada must be made to see the truth! Now, for sure, when he has disregarded the Buddha, the Blessed One, he will do honor to other gods!"[16]

So thinking, he illuminated with lavish splendor the space between the funereal gate and the Sītavana Charnel Grounds and said to the Householder Anāthapiṇḍada: "Go forth, householder, not back! Far better for you is going forward, not going back! And why?

(16)[17]A hundred horses, a hundred golden niṣkas, a hundred mule carts,
And a hundred carts full of all sorts of wealth that are pulled by mares—
They are not worth a sixteenth part of a single step on a religious excursion.[18]

Go forth, householder, not back! Far better for you is going forward, not going back! And why?

A hundred Himalayan elephants fitted out with gold and precious ornaments,
With tusks like poles,[19] huge bodies and girth, unstoppable[20]—
They are not worth a sixteenth part of a single step on a religious excursion.

Go forth, householder, not back! Far better for you is going forward, not going back! And why?

A hundred Kāmbojika girls hung with ornaments and ear-rings,
Wearing golden armlets, golden niṣkas on their necks, finely adorned —
They are not worth a sixteenth part of a single step on a religious excursion.[21]

Go forth, householder, not back! Far better for you is going forward, not going back!"[22]

The householder Anāthapiṇḍada then said this to that son of the gods: "Who, sir, are you?"

"I, householder, am the young brahmin named Maduskandha, an old friend of your house. I am the one who died with a mind deeply moved[23] in regard to the monks Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana, and who was reborn among the gods of the Four Great Kings, a resident of this very Funereal Gate. That is why I spoke in this way: 'Go Forth, householder, not back! Far better for you is going forward, not going back!'"

This then occurred to the householder Anāthapiṇḍada: "This Buddha surely must be of no little importance, of no little importance[24] his declaration of Dharma, since now even gods take such trouble to ensure sight of that Blessed One."[25] So thinking he went to the Śītavana Charnel Grounds.[26]

The Blessed One was then outside the *vihāra*, in the open air walking on the ambulatory,[27] for the most part waiting for the householder Anāthapiṇḍada. Anāthapiṇḍada, the householder, first saw the Blessed One from a distance. And

when he saw him he went closer. Having gone up to him the householder greeted the Blessed One with a familiar pleasantry: "I hope the Blessed One has slept well?"[28]

Then on that occasion the Blessed One spoke these verses:

"The brahmin who is completely extinguished he, by all means, sleeps well indeed,
Unstained by passions, freed indeed and without further connection.
When he has cut here all expectation,[29] has broken the fever of his heart,
Tranquil, with thought at peace, he sleeps well."[30]

The Blessed One then took the householder Anāthapiṇḍada, entered the *vihāra*, and sat down on the seat arranged for him. The householder Anāthapiṇḍada showed deference with his head to the feet of the Blessed One[31] and also sat down at one end of the assembly. When he was seated at one end of the assembly, the Blessed One led the householder Anāthapiṇḍada to see by means of his talk about Dharma, he inspired, incited and delighted him. He illuminated in detail those teachings which promote the benefits of purifying, renouncing, and avoiding the enticements, the dangers and defilements of the sensual pleasures[32]--- that which is the preparatory talk about Dharma of Buddhas, Blessed Ones, such as talk about giving, talk about morality, talk about heaven. But when the Blessed One saw that his thought was aroused, vigorous, exhilarated and free of obstruction, that he was suited and able to understand the preeminent teaching of Dharma, then he illuminated in detail the Four Noble Truths--- that which is the preeminent teaching of Dharma of Buddhas, Blessed Ones, that is to say: suffering, its origin, its suppression, the path.

Anāthapiṇḍada, the householder, while still seated on that same seat realized[33] the four noble truths-- that is to say: suffering, its origin, its suppression, the path. Like a pure white cloth readied for dyeing, and plunged in the dye, would take[34] the color entirely, just so the householder Anāthapiṇḍada, seated there on that very same seat, realized the four noble truths-- that is to say: suffering, its origin, its suppression, the path. The householder Anāthapiṇḍada, having seen the Dharma, having found, understood, penetrated the Dharma, having crossed over doubt, having crossed over uncertainty, not dependent on others, nor led by others, found confidence in the instruction of the Teacher in regard to things,[35] rose from his seat, put his upper robe over one shoulder, made the gesture of supplication to the Blessed One, and said this to him: "I have gone forth, Reverend One, gone forth.[36] I am one who goes to the Blessed One as refuge, and to the Dharma, and to the Community of Monks. Keep me, for this day forward and for as long as I live and have breath, as a lay-brother[37] who has gone[38] for refuge and who has been deeply moved[39]!"

VII. *Anāthapiṇḍada Invites the Buddha to Śrāvastī, Says He Will Build a Vihāra There, and Is Assigned a Monk Assistant —*

The Blessed One then said this to the householder Anāthapiṇḍada: "What is your name, householder?"

"I, Reverend One, am named Sudatta. But I give alms to the lordless and people consequently refer to me as 'the householder Anāthapiṇḍada, the householder Anāthapiṇḍada.'"

"And, householder, where do you come from?" (18)

"There is, Blessed One, in the eastern countries a town[1] of the Kośalan people named Śrāvastī. I live there. The Blessed One should come to Śrāvastī! I will, for as long as I live, attend to the needs of the Blessed One, together with the Community of Monks, with robes, bowls, bedding and seats,[2] medicines for the sick, and personal belongings.

"But are there *vihāras* in Śrāvastī, householder?"

"No, Reverend One."

"Where there are *vihāras*, householder, the monks consider that a place that they must come to, go to, and stay at."[3]

"The Blessed One should come! I will make it so that there will be *vihāras* in Śrāvastī, and the monks will consider it a place that they must come to, go to, and stay at."

The Blessed One assented to the householder Anāthapiṇḍada by remaining silent, and the householder Anāthapiṇḍada understood by that silence the Blessed One's assent, showed deference to the feet of the Blessed One with his head, and departed. Then, when he had looked after, had accomplished all of what he had to do and his obligations in Rājagṛha, he once again went to the Blessed One, approached, showed deference to the feet of the Blessed One, and sat down at one end of the assembly. So seated the householder Anāthapiṇḍada said this to the Blessed One: "Might you Blessed One, please give me a monk as an assistant? Together with him I will have a *vihāra* built for the Blessed One in Śrāvastī."[4]

The Blessed One thought to himself: "Which monk should guide[5] the householder Anāthapiṇḍada, his dependents, and the people who inhabit Śrāvastī?"-- He saw that it should be the monk Śāriputra.

The Blessed One then addressed the Venerable Śāriputra: "Give your attention, Śāriputra, to the householder Anāthapiṇḍada, his dependents, and the people who inhabit Śrāvastī!"[6]

The Venerable Śāriputra assented to the Blessed One by his silence. Then the Venerable Śāriputra showed deference to the feet of the Blessed One with his head and left his presence.

VIII. *Entrapping the Owner and Stacking the Court: Some Questionable Maneuvers in the Purchase of the Jetavana —*

When that night had passed the Venerable Śāriputra dressed early in the morning, took his bowl and robe, and entered Rājagṛha for alms. He wandered through Rājagṛha for alms, finished his meal, and returned after mid-day. When he had put away the bedding and seat in the same condition as he had found them,[1] he took his bowl and robe and set out wandering towards Śrāvastī.

The householder Anāthapiṇḍada took ample provisions and after passing several successive nights and days[2] reached Śrāvastī. Without even entering Śrāvastī,[3] he wandered along the paths from park to park, from garden to garden, from grove to grove, carefully considering them and saying, "Where will there be a place where I might have a *vihāra* erected for the Blessed One, a place that is neither too far (19) nor too near to Śrāvastī, that is little crowded by day and there is little commotion, that by night has few sounds[4] and little noise, and one is bothered little by insects, mosquitoes, wind, heat, and crawling things?"[5] Then the householder Anāthapiṇḍada saw that the park of Prince Jeta was neither too far nor too near Śrāvastī, that it was little crowded by day and there was little commotion, that by night it had few sounds and little noise, and one was little bothered there by insects, mosquitoes, wind, heat, and crawling things, and when he saw that it occurred to him: "Here I will have a *vihāra* for the Blessed One erected." Without even going first to his own house,[6] he approached Prince Jeta and when he had approached him he said this to him: "Might you, Prince, offer me the park (*ārāma*). I am going to have a *vihāra* for the Blessed One built there."

The Prince said:[7] "That is not my pleasure (*ārāma*), householder, although there is a garden that is mine."

Again a second time, and a third, the householder Anāthapiṇḍada said to Prince Jeta: 'Might you, Prince, offer me the park (*ārāma*).[8] I am going to have a *vihāra* for the Blessed One erected there."

"Householder, I cannot let my pleasure (*ārāma*) go even if covered with ten millions.[9]"

But the householder Anāthapiṇḍada said further: "You, Prince, are the one who has fixed a price for the park.[10] You must accept these gold coins.[11] The park is mine."

"Who is the one who has fixed the price?"

"You are."

And the two of them fell into dispute saying "A price was fixed, a price was not fixed!" They set off for the magistrates.[12] When they were half way there, it occurred to the four guardians of the world:[13] "This householder Anāthapiṇḍada is

committed to erecting a *vihāra* for the Blessed Ones. We should render assistance to him." They then transformed themselves[14] into magistrates and sat on the property court.[15]

The householder Anāthapiṇḍada and Prince Jeta approached the court and Anāthapiṇḍada presented the case in detail to the magistrates. They said: "You, Prince, are the one who fixed a price for the park. You must accept the gold. The park is the householder's."

The prince remained silent.[16]

When the householder Anāthapiṇḍada had carried out huge quantities of gold by wagons, bundles, bags, baskets, buffaloes, cows and donkeys he began to cover all of the Jetavana.[17] But it was not completely finished and a spot remained still uncovered. The householder Anāthapiṇḍada stood there silently for a moment thinking about the matter: "Which of my treasures will be neither too small nor too great so that it will cover this spot not yet covered, and so used I will no longer have the trouble of looking after it?[18]"

Prince Jeta thought to himself: "Surely the householder Anāthapiṇḍada is now experiencing some regret, thinking 'Why have I parted with such a huge amount of money for the sake of a park?'" So thinking he said this to the householder Anāthapiṇḍada (20): "If you, householder, now have some regrets, take this gold! This park will be mine again."

"But, Prince, I have no regrets. I was only standing here for a moment quietly considering this matter: 'Which of my treasures will be neither too small nor too great so that it will cover this spot not yet covered, and so used I will no longer have the trouble of looking after it?'"

Then this occurred to Prince Jeta: "This Buddha surely must be of no little importance, of no little importance his declaration of Dharma, since now this householder has parted with such a huge amount of money for a park."[19] So thinking he said this to the householder Anāthapiṇḍada: "Might you, householder, give me this spot that is not yet covered? I will have the entrance hall erected here for the Blessed One."

The householder Anāthapiṇḍada gave that spot not yet covered to Prince Jeta, and Prince Jeta had the entrance hall erected there for the Blessed One.[20]

IX. *Quelling Local Religious Opposition to the Presence of a Vihāra: Śāriputra Struts his Supernatural Stuff*[1]

Then, saying "The householder Anāthapiṇḍada has undertaken to have a *vihāra* erected for the Blessed One," members of other religious groups[2] united, being very hostile and much upset, and went to the householder Anāthapiṇḍada.

When they approached him they said: "You, householder, must not have a *vihāra* made here for the Śramaṇa Gautama!"

"And why not?"[3]

"We have divided up the towns. Rājagṛha is the Śramaṇa Gautama's; Śrāvastī is ours."[4]

Anāthapiṇḍada said: "You might have divided up the towns, but not my private property.[5] I will have a religious foundation built[6] for whomever I want."

They went before the King, but there too they were defeated by Anāthapiṇḍada. Those members of other religious groups--- a bunch of crows, their tune unchanged[7]-- said: "Householder, we are not going to just give you what you want. But the best disciple of the Śramaṇa Gautama has come. If he defeats us in a contest you should have the *vihāra* made!"

Anāthapiṇḍada said: "Very well. I will seek the consent of the Noble Śāriputra then." The householder Anāthapiṇḍada went to the Venerable Śāriputra. When he had approached him and had shown deference to the feet of the Venerable Śāriputra with his head, he sat down at one end of the assembly. So seated the householder Anāthapiṇḍada said this to the Venerable Śāriputra: "Reverend Śāriputra, members of other religious groups have said this: 'Householder, we are not going to just give you what you want. But the best disciple of the Śramaṇa Gautama has come. If he defeats us in a contest you should have the *vihāra* made!' What is to be done in this regard?"

The Venerable Śāriputra thought to himself: "Do those involved have any roots of merit, or do they not?" He saw: they do. "On whom are they dependent?[8] I, myself." Again he thought to himself: "Are only so many dependent on me and to be guided, or are others also to be guided through this contest?" He saw: there are others too. "When will they assemble?" (21) He saw: after seven days. Having focused his attention in that way,[9] he said: "Make it so, Householder, but in seven days!"

The householder Anāthapiṇḍada was both pleased and delighted. He went to the members of other religious groups and when he approached them he said this: "The Reverend One, the Noble Śāriputra[10] says this: 'Very well. Make it so, but on the seventh day!'"

They thought to themselves: "There can only be two reasons here for his delay: either he wants to run away, or he wants to find supporters. Have we here not got a break?[11] We too should find supporters." And they began to look around for supporters. In the course of looking around for supporters they saw the renunciant named Raktākṣa[12] and said to him: "You are our colleague.[13] We have challenged a disciple of the Śramaṇa Gautama to a contest and he is looking around for supporters. You should render assistance to us!"

"When?"[14]

"In seven days."

"Very well. Then make it so! When you have assembled then let me know."

Being apprehensive and anxious the members of other religious groups continued day after day looking for supporters, and counting the days.

On the seventh day the householder Anāthapiṇḍada had seats arranged on a large open space,[15] and for the Venerable Śāriputra he arranged a lion-seat. Members of other religious groups from many different places assembled, and the inhabitants of Śravastī, and many hundreds of thousands who lived in the surrounding area, some from curiosity,[16] some driven by their former roots of merit. Then when the Venerable Śāriputra, attended by the householder Anāthāpiṇḍada and his dependents, had entered into the circle of disputants,[17] had considered the people to be guided, and, smiling, had with undisturbed and calm demeanor[18] mounted the lion seat, he sat down. And that entire assembly sat, their thought transfixed, considering the Venerable Śāriputra.

The Venerable Śāriputra then addressed the members of other religious groups: "Sirs, will you then create something, or will you transform it?"[19]

They said: "We are going to create something. You must transform it."

The Venerable Śāriputra thought to himself: "If I were to create something the whole world, together with its gods, would not even be able to transform it, how much less could the renunciant Raktākṣa." So thinking, he said this to the renunciant Raktākṣa: "Create something then! I will transform it."

Raktākṣa was skilled in magic.[20] He conjured up a fragrant mango tree in full flower. But the Venerable Śāriputra sent forth a terrific blast of wind and rain (22) which tore it apart, roots and all, and scattered it around everywhere, until even practitioners of yoga could not perceive it.

Ratākṣa then conjured up a lotus pond. But the Venerable Śāriputra conjured up a young elephant which completely destroyed it.

Raktākṣa conjured up a seven-headed serpent demon. But the Venerable Śāriputra conjured up a garuḍa bird which carried it off.

Finally Raktākṣa conjured up a zombie.[21] But the Venerable Śāriputra staked him down with mantras.[22] Being badly employed, the zombie was intent on killing Raktākṣa himself.[23] He rushed upon him and Raktākṣa then was afraid, frightened, terrified, his hair standing on end. He fell at the feet of the Venerable Śāriputra saying: "Noble Śāriputra, you must save me! I have gone for refuge.[24]" The Venerable Śāriputra then unstaked the mantras and the zombie was pacified.

The Venerable Śāriputra taught the Dharma to Raktākṣa.[25] He, deeply moved,[26] said: "Noble Śāriputra, might I obtain admittance, ordination and the state of a monk in this well proclaimed Doctrine and Discipline. Might I practice the religious life under the Noble Śāriputra."[27]

The Venerable Śāriputra admitted him, ordained him, and gave him admonition, and he, by setting to work, exerting himself and struggling, directly realized the state of an *arhat* through abandoning all impurities. Being an *arhat* he had no interest in the three spheres; a lump of dirt and gold were the same to him; he regarded all of space and the palm of his own hand as the same; for him an adze was the same as sandal paste; his shell shattered by knowledge; knowledge, supernatural knowledge, and special knowledge were obtained; his back was turned on the desire for the world and donations and on honors; and he became an object of veneration, respect, and deference for the gods including Indra and Upendra.[28]

The whole assembly, then, their eyes wide with amazement and deeply moved[29] by the Venerable Śāriputra said: "A mighty bull of a contestant[30] has been overwhelmed by the Noble Śāriputra," and so thinking they sat gazing[31] at his face.[32] When the Venerable Śāriputra became aware of the inclination, disposition, condition and propensity of that assembly, he gave such an explanation of the Dharma dealing with the four noble truths that when they heard it many hundreds of thousands of people arrived at great distinction[33]-- some produced the thought that is directed toward the awakening of a disciple, some that which is directed towards individual awakening, and some that which is directed toward unsurpassed, entire and complete awakening; some undertook going for refuge and the rules of training; some directly realized the fruit of entering the stream, some the fruit of returning only once, some that of not returning, and some, having entered into the religious life, directly realized the state of an *arhat* by abandoning all impurities. That assembly was, indeed, almost entirely inclined toward the Buddha, disposed toward the Dharma, in favor of the Community.

X. *The Local Religious Opposition Does Not Give Up Easily: A Little More Magic Mixed with Some Kindness*

But the members of other religious groups thought to themselves: "We cannot overwhelm this one in any contest-- we must try some other means or arrangement. We could do the wage labor here.[1] Then, when we get our chance, we can, with a little bait, do him in."

When they had got together and gone to the householder Anāthapiṇḍada they said: "You, householder, have completely cut off all the foundations of our livelihood. Have some pity on us! We will work for wages on your *vihāra*.[2] We have been here a long time. Surely you will not make us abandon our country!"

Anāthapiṇḍada said: "I will ask the Noble Śāriputra for permission then," and he went to the Venerable Śāriputra. Having approached him (23) he said this to the Venerable Śāriputra: "The members of other religious groups, Noble One, said: 'You have completely cut off all the foundations of our livelihood. Have some pity

on us! We will work for wages on your *vihāra*. We have been here a long time. Surely, you will not make us abandon our country!"

The Venerable Śāriputra proceeded to focus his attention: "do they have some roots of merit, or do they not?" He saw: they do. "On whom are they dependent? -- me myself." After he had focused his attention he said: "Make it so, householder. Where is the harm in it?"

They began to work for wages on the *vihāra*. The Venerable Śāriputra conjured up a frightful fellow as the work-boss[3] and he began to have that work done. When the Venerable Śāriputra knew that the time was right for their religious training, then he continued to do his walking exercise[4] under a nearby tree. Those members of other religious groups who were now wage-laborers saw him and thought to themselves: "Now is the time to do away with this monk. He is all alone."[5] They approached and hemmed him in.

The Venerable Śāriputra thought to himself: "With what sort of thought have these approached me?" When he saw: with the thought of murder, he let loose that conjured work-boss and he scattered[6] them shouting "Get out of here! Get to work!"

They said: "Protect us, Noble Śāriputra!"

Śāriputra said to the conjured work-boss: "Go, Venerable One![7] They must be left alone!"

They thought to themselves: "Such a one as this is indeed quite magnificent! Although we had thoughts of murder in regard to him, he had thoughts of friendliness[8] towards us." So thinking they were deeply moved.[9]

[10]The Venerable Śāriputra, when he became aware of their inclinations, dispositions, condition and propensities, gave such an explanation of the Dharma dealing with the four noble truths that when they heard it they shattered with the thunderbolt of knowledge the mountain of the view of real individuality[11] which has twenty peaks, and directly realized the fruit of entering the stream. Having seen the truths, they said: "Śāriputra, might we obtain admittance, ordination, and the state of a monk in this well proclaimed Doctrine and Discipline. Might we practice the religious life under the Reverend Śāriputra."

The Venerable Śāriputra admitted them, ordained them, and gave them admonition, and they, by being set to work, by exerting themselves and struggling came to understand this very five part wheel of rebirth-- both moving and stopped-- threw down all conditioned states because they are characterized by ruin, decline, destruction, and crumbling, and directly realized the state of *arhat* through abandoning all impurities. Being *arhat*s they had no interest in the three spheres; a lump of dirt and gold were the same to them; they regarded all of space and the palm of their own hands as the same; for them an adze was the same as sandal paste, their shell shattered by knowledge, the various forms of knowledge, supernatural

knowledge and special knowledge were obtained, their backs were turned on desire for the world and donations and on honors,[12] and they became objects of veneration, respect and deference for the gods including Indra and Upendra.

XI. *Building a Vihāra Down Here Creates a Mansion in Heaven: Śāriputra's Revelation.*

(24) The Venerable Śāriputra then took hold of one end of the carpenter's cord for the *vihāra,*[1] and the householder Anāthapiṇḍada took hold of the other end as well. The Venerable Śāriputra began to smile. The householder Anāthapiṇḍada said: "Not without cause, not without reason, Noble Śāriputra, do Tathāgatas or the disciples of Tathāgatas smile-- what, Noble Śāriputra, is the cause, what is the reason for this smile?"

"Just so, householder, just so. Not without cause or reason do Tathāgatas or the disciples of Tathāgatas smile. But when you took hold of the carpenter's cord here a mansion of gold was produced among the gods in the Tuṣita Heaven."

The householder Anāthapiṇḍada then, his eyes wide with amazement, said: "If that is so, Noble Śāriputra, then you must indeed extend the cord still more!--- I am more and more deeply moved.[2]"

The Venerable Śāriputra took hold of that carpenter's cord. The householder Anāthapiṇḍada--- through the force of a more and more powerfully deep feeling-- was still more deeply moved,[3] and through that deep feeling[4] the mansion of gold was immediately transformed into one made now of the four jewels, and the Venerable Śāriputra informed him of that.[5]

With his mind focused on ever more increased merit, the householder Anāthapiṇḍada then had sixteen large *vihāras*[6] erected and the sites for sixty huts.[7] When he had the sixteen large *vihāras* erected and the sites for sixty huts, and when he had filled them with all their accouterments, he went to the Venerable Śāriputra, and having approached him, said: "When the Blessed One travels, Noble Śāriputra, how long are the stages in his journey?"

"The same as for a wheel-turning king."

"But how long are they for a wheel-turning king?"[8]

"A wheel-turning king travels in stages of ten leagues, householder."

The householder Anāthapiṇḍada then calculated the number of halting places[9] between Śrāvastī and Rājagṛha and had way stations[10] erected, alms halls made, and stationed a man there to announce the time.[11] He had gateways erected that were made beautiful[12] with umbrellas, banners, and flags, were sprinkled with sandalwood water and hung with pots of pleasing incense. And he had seasonal and night time medicines prepared.

When all the necessaries had been procured Anāthapiṇḍada addressed one of his men:[13] "Ho, man, go! Approach the Blessed One! And when you have approached him and have shown deference to the feet of the Blessed One, you must ask, on my behalf, after the good state of his health, his physical well-being and condition, his needs, vigor and ease, and if he is without complaint and dwelling in comfort! And you must speak in this way "'May the Blessed One come to Śrāvastī! I, Anāthapiṇḍada, will attend to the Blessed One, (25) together with the Community of Monks, for as long as I live,[14] with robes, bowls, bedding and seats, medicine for illness, and personal belongings.'"

The man assented to the householder Anāthapiṇḍada saying "Yes, Noble One," and set off for Rājagṛha. In time he arrived at Rājagṛha and then, after he had recovered from the fatigue of his journey, he approached the Blessed One. When he had approached and shown deference with his head to the feet of the Blessed One he sat down at one end of the assembly. So seated that man said this to the Blessed One: "Reverend, The householder Anāthapiṇḍada shows deference with his head to the feet of the Blessed One... and as before, up to...'dwelling in comfort.'"

The Blessed One said: "Ho, man, may both the householder Anāthapiṇḍada and you be at ease!"

"Reverend One, the Householder Anāthapiṇḍada speaks thus: 'May the Blessed One come to Śrāvastī! I will attend to the Blessed One, together with the Community of Monks, for as long as I live, with robes, bowls, bedding and seats, medicine for illness, and personal belongings.'"

The Blessed One gave his consent to the man by remaining silent. When the man understood that the Blessed One had given his consent by remaining silent, he showed deference with his head to the feet of the Blessed One and departed.

XII. *The Buddha Goes to Śrāvastī with Considerable Pomp and Circumstance*

[1]The Blessed One, then, restrained and surrounded by those who were restrained, calm and surrounded by those who were calmed, freed and surrounded by those who were free, emboldened and surrounded by those who were emboldened, disciplined and surrounded by those who were disciplined, an *arhat* surrounded by *arhats,* devoid of desire and surrounded by those who were devoid of desire, beautiful and surrounded by those who were beautiful[2]-- like a bull surrounded by his herd, like an elephant surrounded by its young, like a lion surrounded by other beasts of prey, like a goose surrounded by a flock of geese, like a garuḍa surrounded by a flock of birds, like a sage surrounded by his students,[3] like a physician surrounded by a crowd of patients, like a powerful soldier surrounded by his warriors, like a guide surrounded by a group of travelers, like the leader of a

caravan surrounded by a horde of merchants, like a prominent man surrounded by his entourage, the ruler of a fort by his counselors, a wheel-turning king by this thousand sons, the moon by the constellations, the sun by its thousand rays, Dhṛtarāstra by the *gandharvas*, Virūḍhaka by the *kumbhaṇḍas*, Virūpākṣa by the nāgas, Dhanada by the *yakṣas*, Vemacitrin by the asuras, like Śakra surrounded by the host of the thirty-three, like Brahmā surrounded by the gods of Brahmā, like an ocean full of water, like a rain cloud bringing moisture, like a lord of elephants free from rut-- with his faculties well restrained, his demeanor and appearance unruffled, fully ornamented with the thirty-two physical characteristics of the great man, his limbs glorious with the eighty secondary signs, his figure ornamented with a nimbus that extended a full fathom, a nimbus that surpassed thousands of suns, stunningly beautiful[4] like a moving mountain of jewels (26), possessed of the ten powers, the four forms of fearlessness, the three special foundations of mindfulness and great compassion-- he, being followed by the Community of Monks, by the householder Anāthapiṇḍada and his dependents, by the inhabitants of Śrāvastī and several hundreds of thousands of gods, arrived at the city Śrāvastī.

And when the Blessed One was entering the city of Śrāvastī and put his right foot down on the threshold of the city with a determined intention,[5] then the earth quaked in six ways: the whole world moved, trembled and shook; it rolled, swayed and jerked. The eastern quarter heaved up, the western sank down; the western heaved up, the eastern sank down; the southern heaved up, the northern sank; the northern heaved up, but the southern sank down; the ends heaved up and the middle sank down; the middle heaved up but the ends sank down. And this entire world, together with the otherwise always dark intermediate spaces,[6] was suffused with a dazzling light, the drums of heaven were pounded, and the gods, hovering in the air, began to scatter divine blue lotuses down upon the Blessed One-- they scattered lotuses, red lotuses and white, aloe wood powder, saffron powder, Tamāla leaves and divine mandāra flowers. And they waved their garments. When the Blessed One actually entered into the city there were these sorts of wonders[7] and others as well-- the narrow became broad and the low became high and the high became even. Elephants trumpeted,[8] the horses neighed and bulls bellowed. In the houses all sorts of musical instruments[9] played on their own; the blind obtained sight, the deaf hearing, the dumb were able to speak, and those who had impaired faculties regained their full use. Those who were drunk came to be sober; those who were poisoned came to be free of it. Those who were mutual enemies came to be friends; pregnant women successfully gave birth; those held in bonds were set free, and the poor obtained riches-- these and hundreds of thousands of other marvels appeared when the Blessed One entered into the city.[10]

XIII. *A Telling Glitch in the Presentation of the Vihāra and an Attempt to Account for Its Anomalous Name*

The Blessed One, then, had entered Śrāvastī with such great honor,[1] and having entered sat down at the front of the Community of Monks on the seat prepared for him. The householder Anāthapiṇḍada, surrounded by friends, family, relatives and kin (27), took up a golden vase and started to pour the water of donation,[2] but it would not come out. Feeling badly, the householder Anāthapiṇḍada thought to himself: "Surely I must have committed some faulty acts?"[3]

The Blessed One said: "You, householder Anāthapiṇḍada, have not committed any faulty acts. It is rather that while standing on this spot you presented it to former Fully and Completely Awakened Buddhas. You must pour on another spot!"[4]

When Anāthapiṇḍada had poured on another spot then the Blessed One himself declared aloud with a voice with five qualities the Jetavana, and when the Jetavana was being declared aloud Prince Jeta thought to himself: "Ah, indeed, might the Blessed One take up just my name the very first of all!"

The Blessed One knew through his own thought what Prince Jeta was thinking and took that name up first, saying "This, monks, is the Jetavana, the Park of Anāthapiṇḍada."[5]

When Prince Jeta heard that he was very deeply moved,[6] saying "The Blessed One has taken up my name first," and--- delighted and joyful--- he had an entrance hall made of the four jewels built for the Blessed One using all of his resources.

> ---*Accordingly, the Compilers, the Elders, also recorded in the Sūtra, "The Blessed One was staying in Śrāvastī, in the Jetavana, in the Park of Anāthapiṇḍada"*--[7]

XIV. *Legal or Not, Anāthapiṇḍada Had Given the Same Land before and Will Do It Again.*

The monks had some uncertainties and asked He who Cuts Off All Uncertainty, the Buddha, the Blessed One:[1] "When, Reverend One, did the householder Anāthapiṇḍada previously present this piece of ground[2] to former Fully and Completely Awakened Buddhas?"

The Blessed One said: "In a past time, monks, in the ninety first aeon, a Fully and Completely Awakened Buddha named Vipaśyin[3] appeared in the world--- Perfect in Knowledge and Conduct, a Sugata, One who Knows the World, Unexcelled, a Leader of Men who can be Tamed, a Teacher of Gods and Men, a

Buddha, a Blessed One.[4] With a train of sixty-two thousand monks he arrived at this spot.[5] At that time too there was in this Śrāvastī a householder named Tiṣya. When he had covered this piece of land with six leagues of gold coins, had bought it[6] from a royal prince, he presented it to Vipaśyin, the Fully and Completely Awakened Buddha, entered into his Order,[7] and directly realized the state of an *arhat* by abandoning all impurities.

A nephew of the householder Tiṣya, through his association with him,[8] was profoundly impressed[9] in regard to the Tathāgata Vipaśyin. He had a *stūpa* built for the hair and nail-clippings[10] of Vipaśyin (28), the Fully and Completely Awakened Buddha. He then thought to himself: "By what means might I be able to see this *stūpa* without obstruction both at night and in the day?"[11]

One of his dependents[12] who lived on the shore of the ocean gave him a self luminous jewel as a gift.[13] He mounted it on that shrine[14] and through its powerful effect[15] he saw the *stūpa* of hair and nail clippings without obstruction both at night and in the day.[16] Then, deeply moved,[17] he made a vow:[18] "As my uncle bought[19] this piece of land from a prince, covered it with gold coins, and presented it to Vipaśyin, the Fully and Completely Awakened Buddha, just so may I cover this piece of land with gold coins[20] and present it to seven Fully and Completely Awakened Buddhas. May I enter the Order of the last of these and directly realize the state of an *arhat* by abandoning all impurities!"

What do you think, monks? He who was the nephew of that householder, that was this householder Anāthapiṇḍada at that time, on that occasion.

After that, in the thirty first aeon, a Teacher named Śikhin appeared in the world...and as before, up to... a Buddha, a Blessed One. He, with a train of sixty thousand monks, arrived at this spot. At that time too there was a householder named Puṣya. When he had covered this piece of land for two and a half leagues[21] with *maṇi* jewels, had bought it[22] from a prince, he presented it to Śikhin, the Fully and Completely Awakened Buddha together with the Community of his Disciples. Would it then occur to you, monks, that at that time, on that occasion, the householder named Puṣya was someone else? Not so, again, should it be seen. Rather, that was this same householder Anāthapiṇḍada, at that time, on that occasion.

After that, in this same thirty first aeon, a Teacher named Viśvabhuj appeared in the world...and as before, up to...a Buddha, a Blessed One. He, with a train of sixty thousand monks, arrived at this spot. At that time too there was householder named Māghu. He too covered this spot for two leagues with pearls, bought it from a prince, and presented it to Viśvabhuj, the Fully and Completely Awakened Buddha, together with his Community of Disciples. Would it then occur to you, monks, (29) that at that time, on that occasion, the householder named

Māghu was someone else? Not so, again, should it be seen. Rather, that was this same householder Anāthapiṇḍada, at that time, on that occasion.

After that, in this auspicious aeon, a Teacher named Krakutsunda appeared in the world...and as before, up to...a Buddha, a Blessed One. He, with a train of forty thousand monks, arrived at this spot. At that time too there was a householder named Bhavadatta. He too filled this spot with cattle, bought it from a prince, and presented it to Krakutsunda, the Fully and Completely Awakened Buddha, together with his Community of Disciples. Would it then occur to you, monks, that at that time, on that occasion, the householder named Bhavadatta was someone else? Not so, again, should it be seen. Rather, that was this same householder Anāthapiṇḍada at that time, on that occasion.

After that, in this same auspicious aeon, when a person's normal lifespan was thirty thousand years, a Teacher named Kanakamuni appeared in the world...and as before, up to...a Blessed One. He, with a train of thirty-thousand monks arrived at this spot. At that time too there was a householder named Bṛhaspati. He too covered this spot with cloth,[23] bought it from a prince, and presented it to Kanakamuni, the Fully and Completely Awakened Buddha, together with the Community of his Disciples. Would it then occur to you, monks, that at that time, on that occasion, the householder named Bṛhaspati was some else? Not so, again, should it be seen. Rather, that was this same householder Anāthapiṇḍada at that time, on that occasion.

After that, again in this same auspicious aeon, when a person's normal life-span was twenty thousand years, an Entirely and Completely Awakened One named Kāśyapa appeared in the world...and as before, up to...a Buddha, a Blessed One. He, with a train of twenty thousand monks,[24] arrived at this spot. At that time too there was a householder named Āṣāḍha. He too covered this piece of land for nine leagues with golden grains,[25] bought it from a prince, and presented it to Kāśyapa, the Fully and Completely Awakened Buddha, together with the community of his Disciples. Would it then occur to you, monks, that at that time, on that occasion, the householder named Āṣāḍha was someone else? Not so, again, should it be seen. Rather, that was this same householder Anāthapiṇḍada, at that time, on that occasion.

(30) Now too I, monks, a Teacher, have appeared in the world, a Tathāgata, Arhat, Fully and Completely Awakened One, Perfect in Knowledge and Conduct, a Sugata, One who knows the World, Unexcelled, a Leader of Men who can be Tamed, a Teacher of Gods and Men, a Buddha, a Blessed One. I too, with a train of twelve hundred and fifty,[26] have arrived at this spot. Now too the householder Anāthapiṇḍada has covered with a layer of ten million the ground plowed by a plow pulled by a team of sixteen,[27] has bought it[28] from Prince Jeta, and presented it to me, together with the Community of my Disciples.[29]

There will also be, monks, in the future, when a person's normal life-space is eighty thousand years, a Teacher named Maitreya. He too, with a train of ninety six ten millions of thousands of *arhats*,[30] will come to this spot. At that time too a householder named Sudhana will arise. He too, when he has covered this spot for three yojanas with gold coins, has bought it off a prince, will present it to Maitreya together with the Community of his Disciples. When he has entered Maitreya's Order he will directly realize the state of an *arhat* by abandoning all impurities. Would it then occur to you, monks, that at that time, on that occasion, the householder named Sudhana will be someone else? Not so, again, should it be seen. Rather, that will be this same householder Anāthapiṇḍada.

XV. *The Religious Roots of Anāthapiṇḍada's Extraordinary Vision and Poking Some Fun at Other Religious Groups* [1]

The householder Anāthapiṇḍada saw hoards whether they had an owner or not, whether they were in the ground or in water, whether they were far away or near.[2] It was said everywhere "The householder Anāthapiṇḍada sees hoards whether they have an owner or not, whether they are in the ground or in water, whether they are far away or near." Now at that time large numbers of members of various religious groups, śramaṇas, brahmins, carakas,[3] and wanderers had assembled and were seated in the hall where they gossiped,[4] and a discussion and conversation of this sort arose: "What physical mark[5] does the householder Anāthapiṇḍada have since he sees hoards whether they have an owner or not, whether they are in the ground or in water, whether they are far away or (31) near?"

A young Brahmin named Upagu had on that occasion come and was seated in the assembly. He said: "You, sirs, should not worry. When I have looked into it, Sirs, I will tell you what physical mark the householder Anāthapiṇḍada has which allows him to see hoards whether they have an owner or not, whether they are in the ground or in water, whether they are far away or near." He then constantly followed behind the householder Anāthapiṇḍada, totally occupied with watching his movement and activities, until on one occasion when the householder Anāthapiṇḍada had bathed in the Ajīravatī River and come out.[6] Then he slapped him on the back with his hand.[7] Although the householder Anāthapiṇḍada saw him, he said nothing.

The young Brahmin said: "You, householder, are wise. You have patience and gentleness[8] as a consequence of which you see hoards, whether they have an owner or not, whether they are in the ground or water, whether they are far away or near." Then he informed the members of other religious groups and they, bragging, spread it around everywhere. Everywhere, it was said: "The householder Anāthapiṇḍada has patience and gentleness by which he sees hoards, whether they

have an owner or not, whether they are in the ground or in water, whether they are far away or near."

The monks reported this matter to the Blessed One, and the Blessed One said: "Monks, it would not be easy for even ten million hundreds of thousands of members of other religious groups to know what physical mark the householder Anāthapiṇḍada had by which he sees hoards. Rather, the householder Anāthapiṇḍada has an inner eye of variegated jewels and a voice of gold,[9] as a consequence of which he sees hoards whether they have an owner or not, whether they are in the ground or in water, whether they are far away or near.

The monks, then, had some uncertainties and asked He who Cuts off All Uncertainty, the Buddha, the Blessed One: "But, Reverend One, through the maturation of which action that he had done did the householder Anāthapiṇḍada come to have an inner eye of variegated jewels and a voice of gold?"

The Blessed One said: [10]"Monks, actions were done and accumulated by the householder Anāthapiṇḍada alone that had arrived at their fullness, their causes matured, in full flood, imminent, unavoidable. Since the householder Anāthapiṇḍada had done and accumulated these actions, how could someone else experience the result? Monks, actions done and accumulated do not mature outside, in the element of earth, nor in the element of water, nor in the elements of heat or wind. Rather, actions that are done-- both good and bad-- mature only when the constituents, elements, and spheres of a living thing are acquired.

> Actions which are done never vanish even
> After a hundred aeons,
> But, having reached completion and the proper
> Time, they bear fruit for living creatures.

(32) In a past time, monks, there was a householder living in a rural village who was rich and had great wealth, many possessions, wide and extensive holdings; he approached Vaiśravaṇa in wealth, rivaled Vaiśravaṇa in wealth.[11] When spring time had come, and the trees were in full flower, and the woods were filled with the sounds of geese, curlews and peacocks, of parrots, mainas, cuckoos and pheasants, he, with his household, went out to his gardens.[12]

--When there are no Buddhas then solitary buddhas appear in the world who are compassionate towards the forsaken and miserable, prefer to have a bed and seat on the margins, and are alone worthy of the world's gifts--[13]

When a solitary Buddha was wandering through the countryside, he came to that rural village and stayed at a spot in that garden. The groundskeeper informed the householder: "On that spot over there a renunciant of calm demeanor is staying."

When he heard that the householder was delighted. Saying "fortunate am I that such a renunciant is staying in my garden." He, being deeply moved,[14] set out to have sight of him.[15] But that high-minded one, the solitary Buddha, had entered the sphere of nirvāṇa in which there is no remainder and was dead.[16] The householder, then, with his friends, family, relatives, household and associates, cremated him with great honors, extinguished the pyre with milk, and placed the bones in a crystal pot mixed with jewels.[17] And the bones inside the pot[18] gave off a brilliant light and emitted sound.

The householder then fell at their feet[19] and made this vow: "As this renunciant's bones mixed with jewels shine inordinately and emit sound, just so may I, through this root of merit, come to have an inner eye of variegated jewels and a voice of gold!"

What do you think, monks? He who was that householder was at that time, on that occasion, this very same householder Anāthapiṇḍada. He performed the funeral honors[20] for the solitary Buddha and made the vow. He, as the nephew of the householder Tiṣya, mounted the self-luminous *maṇi* jewel on the *stūpa* of the hair and nail clippings of the Fully and Completely Awakened One Vipaśyin.[21] Through the maturation of that action he came to have an inner eye of variegated jewels and a voice of gold. Indeed, monks, the maturation of entirely black actions is entirely black; of entirely white actions it is entirely white; of those that are mixed it too is mixed. Therefore, monks, one should train in such a way that (33) he has left behind black actions and those that are mixed, and satisfaction should be found only in actions which are entirely white. In this way, monks, you must train!"[22]

[23]The Internal Summary of Contents:

Tiṣya and Puṣya and Māghu, Bhavadatta and Bṛhaspati;
Āṣāḍha and Sudatta-- Sudhana is the Last.
Gold and coins-- *maṇi* jewels and pearls are the third.
With cattle, with cloth, with grain-- ten million raised with gold

Abbreviations

(Only those abbreviations which are frequently used or will otherwise not be obvious are listed)

Adhikaraṇavastu = see Gnoli

Avadāna-çataka (Feer) = L. Feer, *Avadāna-çataka. Cent légendes bouddhiques* (Annales du musée guimet XVIII) (Paris: 1891).

Avadānaśataka (Speyer) = J.S. Speyer, *Avadānaçataka. A Century of Edifying Tales* (Bibliotheca Buddhica III) (St. Petersburg: 1902-09) cited by volume, page and line.

BHSD = F. Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary* (New Haven: 1953).

BHSG = F. Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar* (New Haven: 1953).

Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo = Zhang Yisun et al, *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo* (Beijing: 1985) Vols. I-III.

BSBM = G. Schopen, *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks. Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India* (Honolulu: 1997).

Derge = *The Tibetan Tripitaka. Taipei Edition,* ed. A.W. Barber (Taipei: 1991) — unless otherwise stated all references are to the *'dul ba* section and give volume letter, original folio number, and line number.

Divyāvadāna = E.B. Cowell & R.A. Neil, *The Divyāvadāna. A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends* (Cambridge: 1886) — cited by page and line number.

Dutt = N. Dutt's edition of the Sanskrit text of the *Śayanāsanavastu* published in N. Dutt, *Gilgit Manuscripts* (Srinagar: 1943) Vol. III, Part 3, 121-44.

GMs iii = N. Dutt. *Gilgit Manuscripts,* Vol. III, Part 1 (Srinagar: 1947); Part 2 (Srinagar: 1942); Part 3 (Srinagar: 1943); Part 4 (Calcutta: 1950) — cited by volume, part, page and line number.

Gnoli = Gnoli's edition of the Sanskrit text of the *Śayanāsanavastu* published in R. Gnoli, *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Śayanāsanavastu and the Adhikaraṇa-vastu* (Serie Orientale Roma, 50) (Rome: 1978) 3-56 — cited by page and line.

JIABS = *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*

JIP = *Journal of Indian Philosophy*

Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra (Waldschmidt) = E. Waldschmidt, *Das Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst. Jahrgang 1950 nr. 2 & 3) (Berlin: 1951) Teil II & III — cited according to paragraph numbers.

Mahāvyutpatti = Yumiko Ishihama & Yoichi Fukuda, *A New Critical Edition of the Mahāvyutpatti* (Materials for Tibetan-Mongolian Dictionaries, Vol. I) (Tokyo: 1989).

Ms. = The facsimile reproduction of a part of the Gilgit Manuscript of the *Śayanāsanavastu* in R. Vira & L. Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts (Facsimile Edition)* Part 6 (Śata-Piṭaka Series 10(6)) (New Delhi: 1974) folios 940-949 — note that what are given here as the original folio numbers are off by a hundred, e.g. 214 should be 314, etc. — cited by folio number assigned in the facsimile & line.

Poṣadhavastu (Hu-von Hinüber) = H. Hu-von Hinüber, *Das Poṣadhavastu. Vorschriften für die buddhistische Beichtfeier im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins* (Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik. Monographie 13) (Reinbek: 1994) — by page & line.

Pravrajyāvastu (Eimer) = H. Eimer, *Rab Tu 'Byuṅ Ba'i Gźi. Die tibetische Übersetzung des Pravrajyāvastu im Vinaya der Mūla-sarvāstivādins* (Asiatische Forschungen Bd. 82) (Wiesbaden: 1983) Teil 1& 2 — cited by volume, page & line.

Saṅghabhedavastu = R. Gnoli, *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu*

(Serie Orientale Roma, 49.1 & 2) (Rome: 1977 & 78) — cited by volume, page and line.

Śayanāsanavastu = See Gnoli

Tibetan = Unless otherwise stated refers to the Tibetan translation found in *The Tog Palace Manuscript of the Tibetan Kanjur* (Leh: 1975-1980) Ga 251a.2-301a.4 (=Derge Ga 187a.1-222a.5 = Peking (D.T. Suzuki, *The Tibetan Tripitaka. Peking Edition* (Tokyo/Kyoto: 1955/61) Nge 179a.3-212a.2).

TSD = L. Chandra, *Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary* (New Delhi: 1959-61; repr. Kyoto: 1971).

Udānavarga = F. Bernhard, *Udānavarga* (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden X) (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 54) (Göttingen: 1965; 1968) Bd. I, II — cited by chapter & verse.

Vinayasūtra (Bapat & Gokhale) = P. V. Bapat & V. V. Gokhale, *Vinaya-Sūtra and Auto-Commentary on the Same by Guṇaprabha. Chapter I — Pravrajyā-vastu* (Patna: 1982).

Vinayasūtra (Sankrityayana) = R. Sankrityayana, *Vinayasūtra of Bhadanta Gunaprabha* (Singhi Jain Śāstra Śiksāpītha. Singhi Jain Series - 74) (Bombay: 1981).

Wille = K. Wille, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Vinayavastu der Mūla-sarvāstivādin* (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland. Suppl. Bd. 30) (Stuttgart: 1990).

NOTES

Introduction

[1] See K. Wille, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Vinayavastu der Mūlasarvāstivādin* (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland. Suppl: Bd. 30) (Stuttgart: 1990).
[2] So characterized in Ét. Lamotte, *Histoire du bouddhisme indien. Des origines à l'ère śaka* (Louvain: 1958) 187.
[3] See A. Hirakawa, *Monastic Discipline for the Buddhist Nuns* (Patna: 1982) 12.
[4] Cf. S. Clarke, "The *Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya* — A Brief Reconnaissance Report," forthcoming in a festschrift for Prof. Hajime Sakurabe.
[5] Hirakawa, *Monastic Discipline for the Buddhist Nuns*, 11.
[6] G. Schopen, "Marking Time in Buddhist Monasteries. On Calendars, Clocks, and Some Liturgical Practices," in *Sūryacandrāya. Essays in Honour of Akira Yuyama on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (Indica et Tibetica 35), ed. P. Harrison & G. Schopen (Swisttal-Odendorf: 1998) 178 n. 67, and the paper by C. Vogel cited there.
[7] Clarke, "The *Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya* — A Brief Reconnaissance Report;" Clarke, "The *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Muktaka*," *Buddhist Studies (Bukkyō Kenkyū)* 30 (2001) 81-107. Note however that we have — in addition to the material cited by Clarke — at least two canonical enumerations of the component parts of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* which seem to include the sections or 'books' of the *Uttaragrantha*, one at *Bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga*, Derge Ta 148 a.3-.6 (if, again, this is a Mūlasarvāstivādin work), and one at *Uttaragrantha*, Derge Pa 251b.2-.4. They are also enumerated, and their titles 'explained,' in the colophon at Derge Pa 310b.1-311a.3. — For a very uneven and not infrequently inaccurate survey of the contents of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* in Tibetan see A.C. Banerjee, *Sarvāstivāda Literature* (Calcutta: 1957) 79-246.
[8] But even this estimate is much to small since Dutt misread the number on the final folio of the *Vinayavastu* manuscript: he read as 423 what is in fact the number 523, and so thought that the manuscript contained a hundred less folios than it did — see Wille, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung*, 22, and the sources cited there.
[9] Quoted, for example, at Ed. Huber, "Études bouddhiques. I. Les fresques inscrites de turfan," *Bulletin de l'école française d'extrême-orient* 14 (1914) 13.
[10] S. Lévi, "Les saintes écritures du bouddhisme. Comment s'est constitué le canon sacré," *Mémorial Sylvain Lévi* (Paris: 1937) 78 [originally published in *Annales du musée guimet*, Bibliothèque de vulgarisation 31 (1908-09) 105-29].
[11] E. Waldschmidt, *Das Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra. Text in Sanskrit und Tibetisch, verglichen mit dem Pāli nebst einer Übersetzung der chinesischen Entsprechung im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins*, Teil I-III (Berlin: 1949-51).
[12] *Saṅghabhedavastu* ii 216-51.
[13] H. Matsumura, *The Mahāsudarśanāvadāna and the Mahāsudarśanasūtra* (Delhi: 1988).

14 *Saṅghabhedavastu* i 5-16; *Vibhaṅga*, Derge Ca 106a.3-113a.6; G. Schopen, "The Monastic Ownership of Servants or Slaves: Local and Legal Factors in the Redactional History of Two *Vinayas*," *JIABS* 17.2 (1994) 158ff. esp. n. 33.

15 J.-U. Hartmann, "Fragmente aus dem Dīrghāgama der Sarvāstivādins," in *Sanskrit-Texte aus dem buddhistischen Kanon: Neuentdeckungen und Neueditionen* (Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden. Beiheft 2), Bearbeitet von F. Enomoto et al. (Göttingen: 1989) 37-67; esp. 65-67.

16 *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, GMs iii 1, 45.13-.19; Derge Kha 144b.1-145a.4. This little text, which at least in its Mūlasarvāstivādin version deals with an important 'moment' in the acquisition of permanent buildings by the Buddhist monastic community, is also quoted elsewhere — Bhikkhu Pāsādika, *Kanonische Zitate im Abhidharmakośabhāṣya des Vasubandu* (Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden. Beiheft 1) (Göttingen: 1989) 75, [275].

17 G. Bongard-Levin et al, "The Nagaropamasūtra: An Apotropaic Text from the Saṃyuktāgama. A Transliteration, Reconstruction, and Translation of the Central Asian Sanskrit Manuscripts," in *Sanskrit-Texte aus dem buddhistischen Kanon: Neuentdeckungen und Neueditionen* III (Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden. Beiheft 6) (Göttingen: 1996) 16, 19 n.26.

18 Lévi refers to "savants, séduits par la belle ordonnance du Canon pali;" "Les saintes écritures du bouddhisme," 77.

19 Lévi, "Les saintes écritures du bouddhisme," 84.

20 J.W. de Jong, "Les *sūtrapiṭaka* des sarvāstivādin et des mūlasarvāstivādin," *Mélanges d'indianisme a la mémoire de Louis Renou* (Paris: 1968) 400-01.

21 O. von Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature* (Berlin: 1996) 19 (§36).

22 For a very good idea of both the extent and kinds of "stories" found in this *Vinaya* see J.L. Panglung, *Die Erzählstoffe des Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya. Analysiert auf Grund der Tibetischen Übersetzung* (Tokyo: 1981), but note that even it is not complete — it does not include the stories that occur in the *Uttaragrantha* — and it is weak in citing parallels found in the *Avadānaśataka*; see G. Schopen, "Dead Monks and Bad Debts: Some Provisions of a Buddhist Monastic Inheritance Law," *Indo-Iranian Journal* 44 (2001) esp. n. 21.

23 R. Gnoli, *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu. Being the 17th and Last Section of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin* (Serie Orientale Roma 49.1) (Rome: 1977) Part I, xxii.

24 Even individual 'stories' sometimes point in this same direction — see the discussion of the various versions of the story of the *stūpa* of the Buddha Kāśyapa at Toyikā in G. Schopen, *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks. Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India* (Honolulu: 1997) 28-29.

25 P. Granoff, "The Ambiguity of Miracles. Buddhist Understandings of Supernatural Power," *East and West* 46 (1996) 88 and n. 20.

26 S. Lévi, "Note sur des manuscrits sanscrits provenant de bamiyan (afghanistan) et de gilgit (cachemire)," *Journal Asiatique* (1932) 23.

27 Lévi, "Les saintes écritures du bouddhisme," 78.

28 In his edition Gnoli too has divided the text into sections and imposed headings on them, but I have chosen not to follow them, and the two 'systems' only partially overlap.

29 Lévi, "Note sur des manuscrits sanscrits," 23-24.

30 See the papers collected in the first part of L. Sternbach, *Juridical Studies in Ancient Indian Law*, Part II (Delhi: 1967).
31 Burnouf had already recognized something of the *'vinaya'* function of the *avadāna* literature that he knew. He knew, for example, that at least some of the *avadānas* in the *Divyāvadāna* occurred in the Tibetan translation of the *Vinaya* and he had said: "maintenant, pour que quelques Avadānas aient pu être compris au Tibet dans le cadre du Vinaya, il fallait que ces Avadānas eussent plus ou moins directement trait à la discipline" (E. Burnouf, *Introduction a l'histoire du bouddhisme indien* (Paris: 1844) 39). In introducing the long extract that he translated from the *Saṃgharakṣitāvadāna* (=*Divyāvadāna* no. 23) he had said that in it "on vît clairement de quelle manière les compilateurs de légendes se sont représenté les obligations imposées aux Religieux réunis dans les Vihāras." In concluding it he had also said: "Une collection complète de légendes de ce genre ne nous laisserait probablement rien ignorer de ces [vinaya] règles; elle nous ferait connaître surtout avec exactitude les devoirs auxquels le régime de la vie commune soumettait les Religieux" (313, 335). — See also II n. 36 below.
32 Sternbach, *Juridical Studies*, ii 2-3.
33 For details see below IV n. 12 — It is worth noting incidentally that the *Pañcatantra* and the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* sometimes tell the same story, e.g. the story entitled "How the Greedy Jackal Died Eating a Bowstring" in P. Olivelle, *The Pañcatantra. The Book of India's Folk Wisdom* (Oxford: 1997) 84, is told in a variant version as the account of a previous life of the monk Upananda at *Cīvaravastu*, GMs iii 2, 121.10-122.19.
34 See the notes to the translation below, especially VIII ns. 7,8,16,17,20; XIII ns. 3,4,5 — Schlingloff, for example, has seen something similar in the different 'versions' of "The Bodhisattva's First Meditation:" "The text of the earliest version could be interpreted to mean that the king himself worked in the fields. This behavior was regarded as unsuitable for a king and therefore, when the episode was rendered into Sanskrit, the formulation was made less explicit (cf. *Majjhimanikāya* I, p. 246, 31-32: *abhijānāmi kno panāhaṃ pitu sakkassa kammante sītāya jambucchāyāya nisinno* with *MSV*, p. 107, 26-27: *abhijānāmy ahaṃ pituḥ śuddhodanasya niveśane karmāntān anusaṅgamya jambucchāyāyāṃ niṣadya):*" D. Schlingloff, *Studies in the Ajanta Paintings. Identifications and Interpretations* (Delhi: 1987) 29. — For an example much farther afield cf.the chapter entitled "Jesus and the Adulteress" in A. Watson, *Ancient Law and Modern Understanding. At the Edges* (Athens/London: 1998) 46-57.
35 For some discussion and references to the secondary literature see G. Schopen, "The Bones of a Buddha and the Business of a Monk: Conservative Monastic Values in an Early Mahāyāna Polemical Tract," *JIP* 27 (1999) 292-93; and the paper "Art, Beauty, and the Business of Running a Buddhist Monastery in Early Northwest India," which will appear as Ch. 2 of G. Schopen, *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters. Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India* (Honolulu: 2002).
36 Ét. Lamotte, *Le traité de la grande vertu de sagesse*, t. III (Louvain: 1970) xi; xviii ("Mais il [the author of *Le traité*] s'inspire bien plus fréquemment encore du *Vinaya des Mūlasarvāstivādin* auquel il emprunte la majorité des Avadāna et des Jātaka dont il agrémente son exposé... Il serait impossible de dresser ici la liste des emprunts plus ou moins directs au *Vinaya des Mūlasarvāstivadin*...")
37 Schlingloff, *Studies in the Ajanta Paintings*, 14, 16ff, 34, 61, 66, 70-71, 118, 152-53, etc.

[38] Bangwei Wang, "Buddhist Nikāyas through Ancient Chinese Eyes," *Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur* (Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden. Beiheft 5), Bearbeitet von F. Bandurski et al (Göttingen: 1994) 181.
[39] For the Turfan material see Wille, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Vinayavastu der Mūlasarvāstivādin*, 134 ff; for the Schøyen material see below I n.9.
[40] For the first see H. Ruelius, "Some Notes on Buddhist Iconometrical Texts," *The Journal of the Bihar Research Society* 54 (1968) 175 and the sources cited there; for the second, O.H. Pind, "Saddavimala 12.1-11 and its Mūlasarvāstivādin origin," in F. Bizot & F. Lagirarde, *La pureté par les mots* (Paris: 1996) 67-72.
[41] See the foreword to Gnoli's edition for the description of how the manuscript material for the *Śayanāsana* was, in effect, pieced together. To this must be added the two additional fragmentary leaves published in Wille, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Vinayavastu der Mūlasarvāstivādin*, 115-21.
[42] Although my translation is based on Gnoli's edition I have not always been able to accept his readings. In fact on at least forty occasions I have — on the basis of the manuscript, the Tibetan translation, or parallels elsewhere — read otherwise, and my proposed readings or emendations are clearly marked in the notes with the word **Read** in bold type.

I

[I.1] As is typically the case with Indian texts the title of the work occurs at its end, not at the beginning where I have put it. The text actually begins with an *uddāna*, a "summary." Such 'summaries,' if they come before the text they are keyed to, can be thought of as a kind of table of contents where the contents are signalled by key-words in what follows; if they follow the text they refer to, they might be described as a kind of 'index' of key-words in what precedes them. There are, moreover, several sub-categories or types of *uddānas* and the system — if it can be called a system — is both complicated and not yet fully understood. The various *uddānas* found in our text are certainly both and will be discussed in an appendix to Part II of the translation, where a rendering and explanation of the opening *uddāna* will also be given. For the moment see J.L. Panglung, "Preliminary Remarks on the *Uddānas* in the *Vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādin," in *Tibetan Studies in Honour of Hugh Richardson*, ed. M. Aris & A.S.S. Kyi (Oxford: 1979) 226-32; R. Salomon, *A Gāndhārī Version of the Rhinoceros Sūtra* (Gandhāran Buddhist Texts 1) (Seattle & London: 2000) 33-36 and the literature cited there.

[I.2] *upasthāna-śālā*. *BHSD* s.v. gives "hall of meeting (for monks)," but cf. *upasthāna-kāri*, "serving, doing service to;" *upasthāyaka*, "*servant, attendant;*" etc. For the corresponding 'hall' among other religious groups see below XV n.4.

[I.3] *arhati...paribhoktum = longs spyod par 'os /.* Forms from *pari√bhuj* have in our *Vinaya* a technical or at least a specific sense. See below.

[I.4] *śākya*. Literally "a member of the *Śākya* clan."

I.5*pravrajita*. This and other related forms will be similarly rendered throughout; cf. Ét. Lamotte, *L'enseignement de Vimalakīrti*, (Louvain: 1962) 384.2: "entré dans la vie religieuse."

I.6*abhirūpo darśanīyaḥ prāsādikaḥ*. Two things should be noted here. Starting at this point Gnoli has made no attempt to punctuate his text and thereby separate the designations into groups. The Tibetan does better but is not always consistent from one 'edition' to another. Adopting Gnoli's conventions **Read** a semi-colon after *prasādikaḥ*. Physical beauty might — but probably should not — strike us as an odd indicator of status. Note, however, that elsewhere in our *Vinaya*, in the Mūlasarvāstivādin version of the *Aggañña-sutta* that is still embedded in its *Saṅghabhedavastu*, virtually the same characteristics determine, for example, who will be the first human king — *Saṅghabhedavastu* i 15.4. See also H. Scharfe, *The State in Indian Tradition* (Leiden: 1989) 35 and notes, on the 'requirement' that a king be handsome, and, more broadly, R.W. Lariviere, "Never Marry a Woman with Hairy Ankles," in *Festschrift Dieter Schlingloff zur Vollendung des 65. Lebenjahres*, hrsg. F. Wilhelm (Reinbek: 1996) 163-72.

I.7 **Read** a semi-colon after *vākkaraṇenopeto*.

I.8There can be very little doubt that *jñāto mahāpuṇyah* represent a distinct pair and that we must **Read** a semi-colon after the latter. They, and their opposites, occur repeatedly as a pair in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and its related literature. That *jñāta* means "famous" is not, of course, problematic— cf. *jñāta-kulīna*, "belonging to a known family" or *jñātra* — sometimes replaced by *jñāta* — "public reputation for skill" (*BHSD* 244). But "of great fortune" for *mahāpuṇya* may at first sight seem more difficult. It appears by usage, however, to have been fairly certainly a circumlocution or euphemism for "rich," and is consistently applied to individuals — almost always monks — who have received large stores of material possessions. There are numerous passages which would support such a meaning. At *Vibhaṅga*, Derge Ca 91a.7, for example, two monks are contrasted. The one described as *grags pa dang / bsod nams che ba yin te* — *jñāto mahāpuṇyaḥ* — is said to have large amounts of bowls, robes and other material possessions (*de la lhung bzed dang / chos gos dang / dra pa dang / phor bu dang / ska rags lhag ba dag yod do*). But the other, described as *grags pa dang / bsod nams chung ste* — *alpa-jñāta-puṇya* — is further described as struggling to get his three robes and even then they were miserable and his waistcloth was old (*chos gos gsum lhur len cing de'i chos gos gsum ngan cing snam sbyar yang yongs su rnyings pa yin no*). At *Vibhaṅga*, Derge Ca 79b.4 a monk who is said to be *shes pa dang ldan pa* — *jñāta* — is also said to be one who has "many material goods, many accoutrements" (*rdza mang ba / yo byad mang ba yin te*): here *mahāpuṇya* is actually replaced by 'having many material goods, etc.' But here too a second monk, with which the first is contrasted and who is described as *shes pa chung ba, alpa-jñāta*, is said to be wanting even in the three robes (*chos gos gsum la 'chel ba yin pa*). Many more passages could be cited here, but some of these have already been discussed elsewhere (G. Schopen, *Daijō bukkyō kōki jidai: Indo no sōin seikatsu*, trans. N. Odani (Tokyo: 2000) 210ff) and the point seems clear: a monk who was *mahāpuṇya* was a monk who had or received large amounts of material possessions. There are, moreover, clear traces of this usage even in Pāli sources — see *Vinaya* iii 45.24 (*mahāpuññ' attha tumhe āvuso, bahuṃ tumhākaṃ cīvaraṃ uppannan ti*) or

Saṃyutta ii 210.3 (*tatra yo hoti bhikkhu ñāto yasassī lābhī cīvarapiṇḍpātasenāsanagilāna-paccayabhesajjaparikkhārānam*).

I.9 *sthaviro rājanyaḥ*, here translated into Tibetan as *gnas brtan rgyal por 'os pa*, is not a common designation, but what is certainly a variant translation of it — *gnas brtan rgyal por gyur pa* — occurs in the *Uttaragrantha*, Derge Pa 33b.7, where it is explained: *ji ltar gnas brtan rgyal po lta bur gyur pa yin zhe na / bsnyen par rdzogs nas lo nyi shu lon par gyur pa 'am / yang na de las 'das so /*: "In what sense is he said to be a veritable Royal Elder? He is one who has been ordained for twenty years, or even more than that." That the *Uttaragrantha*'s *gnas brtan rgyal por gyur pa* was translating *sthaviro...rājanya* was serendipitously confirmed recently when J.-U. Hartmann showed me the transcriptions of some of the manuscript fragments from the Schøyen collection done by K. Wille. Several of these fragments were easily identified as coming from the *Uttaragrantha*, and one of them corresponded to Derge Pa 33b.7. It read — in Wille's transcription — *kathaṃ sthaviro bhavati rājanya viṃśati......* — One cannot help but suspect that *rājanya* is somehow connected with the difficult Pāli designation *rattaññu*, of similar import and applied similarly to monks, and the Jain title *rāiṇiya* (see C. Caillat, *Les expiations dans le rituel ancien des religieux jaina* (Paris: 1965) 60ff), but this cannot be pursued here.

I.10 This is a list of the *dhūtaguṇas* or "severe ascetic practices." In both the printed text and the ms. twelve items are listed, and *BHSD* says that there are twelve in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit sources, as opposed to Pāli sources where there are thirteen *dhutaṅga*. The Tibetan translation of our text, however, also has thirteen, inserting *bsod snyoms mi 'dam pa* between *piṇḍapātika* and *ekāsanika*, and *bsod snyoms mi 'dam pa* looks very much like it might be translating what appears in Pāli as *sāpadāna-cārika*, "one who goes on an uninterrupted begging round (i.e. does not pick and choose)," which, of course, is one of the 'additional' *dhutaṅgas* in the Pāli list. Since it is unlikely in the extreme that the Tibetan translators would have added this item, it must be assumed that there were thirteen items in the Sanskrit text they were working from, and that one of them was something like Pāli *sāpadāna-cārika*, perhaps *sāvadāna-piṇḍapātika* (although one difficulty here is that *Mahāvyutpatti* 8505 gives *mthar chags* or *'thar chags* as the equivalent of *sāvadāna*) — for other variant lists of the *dhūtaguṇas* see P.V. Bapat, *Vimuktimārga Dhutaguṇa-Nirdeśa* (London: 1964) 5 & n.3; A. Wayman, *Analysis of the Śrāvakabhūmi Manuscript* (Berkeley & Los Angeles: 1961) 82; on the *dhutaguṇas* as a whole see now J. Dantinne, *Les qualities de l'Ascete (Dhutaguṇa): Etude sémantique et doctrinale* (Brussels: 1991).

I.11 This is an abbreviation in the text itself. Since it occurs on the first page of the *vastu* the "as before" clearly does not refer to a passage in it. In fact these abbreviations are often used rather loosely and may have little to do with the actual location or physical proximity of the full form of the passage — they often refer simply to passages that are assumed to be well known and that occur in a number of places.

I.12 *sarveṣām asmākam āyuṣmanto na sameti yaduta nānāprajñaptyā* appears in the Tibetan translation as: *tshe dang ldan pa dag bdag cag thams cad ni 'di lta ste / so sor brtags nas mi mthun pa yin gyis /*. See *BHSD* s.v. sameti, where this passage is cited.

I.13Both Gnoli and Dutt read *ete vayaṃ*, but the ms. almost certainly has *eta vayaṃ* (fol. 941.1 — cf. *te vayaṃ* at 941.3). That *eta* is correct, and that it is intended for *etta* = Sanskrit *atra* = "here, hither," seems to be supported by the Tibetan which reads *tshur*, "here, to this place, hitherward." Note that *BHSD* s.v. *etta* cites an instance where the Kashgar ms. of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* has *eta* for what the Nepalese mss. read as *etta;* and note too the usage also cited there where *etta etta* = "here, here!." It is perhaps equally possible to see in *eta* a second person plural imperative from √*i* (cf. the construction *āyām' ānanda yena pāṭaligāmo ten' upasaṃkamissāmāti* (the Buddha is speaking here) at *Dīgha* ii 84.9, and repeatedly in the same text), though in this case the Tibetan should perhaps be *tshur shog* (cf. *Mahāvyutpatti* 6620: *eta yuyam* = *khyed tshur shog* — the citation of this in *TSD* s.v. *tshur* is misleading). Oddly enough either choice produces the same general sense: "Here then, we are going...," or "Come on! We are going..." I have taken here the second possibility, but remain open to the first. In any case **Read**: *eta*.

I.14Both Gnoli and Dutt read: *vṛddhatarako bhikṣur yuṣmābhiḥ satkartavyaḥ...* "You must honor...the more senior monk," and this is the reading of the ms. (fol. 941.4). There are, however, at least three good reasons for thinking that the ms. presents us with a scribal error, and that this was not the original or intended reading. First the statement is supposed to be repeating what the Buddha had just said, and that was not *vṛddhatarako bhikṣur yuṣmābhih satkartavyaḥ,* but *vṛddhatarako yuṣmābhir bhikṣavaḥ satkartavyo...* Second, the Tibetan confirms that the Buddha's original statement and its repetition were exactly the same in the Sanskrit text(s) it was working from — in both cases it has: *dge slong dag khyed kyis ches rgan pa la bsnyen bkur bya* (Ga 252a.7 and .7) = "Monks, you must honor the more senior." Third, if the Buddha had said what the scribe said he said in the repetition none of the misunderstandings or ambiguities which the text goes on to enumerate could have arisen, and the text which follows here would not have made good sense — **Read**: *vṛddhatarako yuṣmābhir bhikṣavaḥ satkartavyo...*

Notice that the force of the Buddha's ruling is to in effect subordinate everything, including learning, asceticism and religious attainment, to the principle of seniority. From the institutional point of view the former simply do not count. Notice too that caste and birth were among the first things to be so subordinated. The principle of seniority was not, however, absolute. The *Śayanāsana* itself puts limits on its application on three different occasions: at XXVI (39.18) it is said not to apply to visiting monks unless they come on "the Community's or *stūpa's* business;" at XXXI (43.3 ff) it is said not to apply when a junior monk is sick; and at XXXIV (49.10) it is again said not to apply to monks who arrive at night. Elsewhere, at *Uttaragrantha,* Derge Pa 124b.4ff, for example, a rule similar to that in *Śayanāsana* XXXIV occurs, and at Derge Pa 125 a.7ff it is said that seniority cannot be invoked in lining up to use the privy.

I.15Gnoli has misparagraphed and mispunctuated the text here. The paragraphing in Dutt is correct but the punctuation there too is overdetermined.

I.16*āgārika* = *khyim pa. BHSD* s.v. gives "householder, one living in worldly life." *āgārika* is fully generic and points to the run-of-the-mill. One so designated is not necessarily a *gṛhapati,* and the use of the term here is almost certainly intended to heighten the anomaly: the monks were honoring not

just *gṛhapatis*, but any non-religious, however common, who was senior. See III n.4 below on the title *gṛhapati*.

I.17 The Tibetan has *bram ze dang khyim bdag dad pa can*, adding the qualifier *śrāddha*, "devout, believing" — see Gnoli 38.15: *śrāddhā brāhmaṇagṛhapatayaḥ* — *śrāddhā* could easily have dropped out of the ms. here.

I.18 *anyatīrthika* = *gzhan mu stegs can*. *BHSD* is almost certainly right in seeing the "original neutral" meaning of *tīrthika* as "adherent (or founder of (any) religion," and when it says "a trace of this may also remain in the not infrequent prefixation of *anya*- to *t[īrthika]*, other (than Buddhist) sectarian."

I.19 Both Gnoli and Dutt read *iha dhārmikān*, but the Tibetan suggests that the collocation was taken as a compound: *chos 'di pa rnams la* and that we should read *ihadhārmika*. Similar compounds are attested — *ihakāla*, "this life," *ihaloka*, "this world" (from Monier-Williams) — and *ihadhārmika* would seem to form a legitimate pendant to *bāhyaka*, whereas *dhārmika* on its own would almost certainly have been too non-specific to meet the needs of the context here. Compare also the examples quoted by *BHSD* from the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, s.v. *bāhyaka*, where this term itself is in compound with *ito*-: *ito-bāhyakeṣu tīrthikeṣu*, "external...to this (i.e. Buddhist);" and note that in the old commentary embedded in the *Vibhaṅga* the title *bhikṣu (dge slong)* is repeatedly glossed by *chos 'di pa*, which in our text is translating, apparently, *ihadhārmika*: *dge slong zhes bya ba ni chos 'di pa'o* (Derge Cha 59a.5); *dge slong dag ces bya ba ni chos 'di pa dag go* (Derge Ja 90b.2); *dge slong gis zhes bya ba ni chos 'di pas so* (Derge Cha 136a.4); etc.

The Tibetan translation (*dge slong dag ngas chos 'di pa rnams la*...), and the parallel constructions which immediately precede and immediately follow our passage (*pravrajitān bhikṣavo mayā*..., *upasampannān bhikṣavo mayā*...), would both seem to indicate that a vocative *bhikṣavo* after *ihadhārmikān* has dropped out of our ms.
Read: *ihadhārmikān bhikṣavo*.

I.20 *vanditavya*, *vandya* = *phyag bya ba*. These will be consistently rendered here as "to show deference" or forms thereof. The Sanskrit can, of course, mean "respect, veneration," even "worship."

I.21 The ms. is damaged here (fol. 941.8), approximately six *akṣaras* being lost. Both Gnoli and Dutt supply *[kati varṣāgrāṇīti]*, probably on analogy with the *kati sāmayikānīti* which occurs almost immediately below in exactly in the same construction: *bhikṣavo na jānate kati sāmayikānīti*. Unfortunately this is not supported by the Tibetan. For our passage it has *dge slong rnams kyis ji ltar dri ba ma shes nas*, "when the monks did not know how to ask;" but for the following passage it has: *dge slong rnams kyis dus tshig du yin pa mi shes nas*, "when the monks did not know what the seasonal periods were" — i.e., according to the Tibetan, the two passages were not entirely parallel. Since the Sanskrit text is undeterminable here I have translated the Tibetan, though, as the next note might indicate, it may have had a somewhat different text here.

I.22The Sanskrit text reads *sāmayikam ārocayitavyam* here and that is what I have translated. The Tibetan, however, has: *re zhig dang por dus tshigs dri bar bya'o,* "One must be asked the seasonal period in the first (year of his ordination)." The Tibetan here is obviously in conformity with its version of the question that immediately precedes it (see n. 19), using a form of *'dri ba* (*√prach*) in both. Both text and translation are therefore tentative — for the "seasonal periods" see next notes.

I.23This scheme is referred to in several places: *Pravrajyāvastu* (Eimer) ii 150.11-.18; B. Jinananda, *Upasampadājñaptiḥ* (Patna: 1961) 19.9-.14; M. Schmidt, "*Bhikṣuṇī-karmavācanā.* Die Handschrift Sansk. c. 25 (R) der Bodleian Library Oxford," in *Studien zur Indologie und Buddhismuskunde. Festgabe des Seminars für Indologie und Buddhismuskunde für Professor Dr. Heinz Bechert,* hrsg. R. Grünendahl et al (Bonn: 1993) 259.20-.23; *Vinayasūtra* (Sankrityayana) 2.16-.17; J. Takakusu, *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practiced in India and the Malaya Archipelago (AD 671-695)* (Oxford: 1896) 101-02; etc. There is general agreement among these sources, and only one textual problem of concern here. For the fourth of these seasons both Gnoli and Dutt read *mṛtavārṣika,* and in so far as I can make it out — at least the facsimile here is damaged (fol. 941.9) — this seems to be the reading of the ms. But *BHSD* s.v. *sāmayika,* quoting notably the Sanskrit of the *Mahāvyutpatti,* already noted that this reading was a problem. Edgerton cites the *Mahāvyutpatti* as *mita-vārṣika* and notes that the Tibetan for our passage is *thung ngu,* "short," which clearly supports it. While the latter is correct, the former is more complicated. The new critical edition the *Mahāvyutpatti* in fact has for the Sanskrit *mṛtavārṣika,* without variants except for Sakaki's old edition cited by Edgerton. Edgerton also cites the old edition of the ms. newly re-edited by Schmidt as giving the form *mita-* twice, and Schmidt does read the second instance there as *mita-*, but the first he reads as *mṛta-*. In the corresponding passages in the *Upasampadājñaptiḥ* Jinananda prints both as *mṛta-*. Both *Vinayasūtra* (Sankrityayana) 2.17 and *Vinayasūtra* (Bapat & Gokhale) 12.11 read *mita-*. Takakusu translates I-Ching as "the fourth is the last season so called," which would also appear to point to *mṛta-*. The interchange of *mita-* and *mṛta* is, therefore, far broader than Edgerton realized and this remains to be worked out. But since the Tibetan renderings that I have seen are consistent — the *Pravrajyā-* and *Śayanāsana-vastus* and the *Mahāvyutpatti* all have *thung ngu,* "short" — and since their meaning is consistent with the description of the season in all sources, this what I have translated. In light of this dual consistency, moreover, I would suggest that for the moment we **Read**: *mitavārṣikam.*

I.24The ms. is damaged here (fol. 941.10). Both Gnoli and Dutt restore *[prajā]yāḥ* and this is supported by Tibetan: *skye dgu.*

I.25Like the Tibetan translators I have translated here, and in the next three sentences, genitive Sanskrit constructions with English instrumentals.

I.26Here the Sanskrit is *gṛhin*, but the Tibetan is again *khyim pa*—cf n.16 above. Note also that both grammar (i.e. its construction with *sarveṣām*) and the Tibetan indicate that *gṛhiṇaḥ* must be emended to *gṛhiṇāṃ* — so **Read.**

I.27Gnoli prints *tadahaḥ* but says the ms. reads *tadarhaḥ*; Dutt prints *tadarhaḥ* without comment. The ms., however, reads *tadarha upa-* (fol. 942.1), although the Tibetan (*de ring*) and parallels elsewhere (Schmidt, "*Bhikṣuṇī-Karmavācanā*," 270.19: *tad ahar upasaṃpannasya;* A.C. Banerjee, *Two Buddhist Vinaya Texts in Sanskrit* (Calcutta: 1977) 72.14 *tadahopasaṃpannena*), make it virtually certain that *tadarha* is a scribal error for *tad ahar*. **Read:** *tad ahar.*

The rule that a nun, regardless of her seniority, must show deference to even the most junior monk is not of course limited to the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* — see É. Nolot, *Règles de discipline des nonnes bouddhistes* (Paris: 1991) 9; M. Wijayaratna, *Les moniales bouddhistes. Naissance et développement du monachisme féminin* (Paris: 1991) 30; 70-71. A. Heirman, "Some Remarks on the Rise of the *bhikṣuṇīsaṃgha* and the Ordination Ceremony for *bhikṣuṇīs* according to the Dharmaguptaka *Vinaya*," *JIABS* 20.2 (1997) 35; etc. But III n. 12 below also makes it clear that the redactors of our *Vinaya* did not just want nuns to be subservient to monks, they also wanted any *vihāra* for nuns to be architecturally inferior to a *vihāra* for monks.

I.28Gnoli prints here *sarvasy[ānu]pasaṃpannakasyopasaṃpannako;* Dutt has *sarvasyopasaṃpannako.* The ms. (fol. 942.1) here is damaged and seems to read: *(sar)v(as)y-xx(pa)-saṃpannasyopasaṃpannako.* Dutt's reading has, of course, very little in common with what is actually found in the ms., but Gnoli is fully supported by the Tibetan: *bsnyen par ma rdzogs pa thams cad kyis phyag bya ba bsnyen par rdzogs pa'o /.* Note however, that the *-ka-* in Gnoli's *-[anu]pasaṃpannaka-* is not found in the ms., and that *BHSD* s.v. *upasaṃpannaka* cites Dutt's reading and must therefore be corrected.

I.29Gnoli and Dutt have both normalized this list. The ms. has: *pāsivāsika mūlapārivāsikaḥ paryuṣitaparivāsaḥ mānāpyacārika caritamānāpyaḥ adarśanāyotkṣiptakaḥ apratikarmayotkṣiptakaḥ apratinisṛṣṭe pāpake dṛṣṭigate utkṣiptakaḥ* (fol. 942.1). Apart from silently correcting *pāsivāsika* to *pārivāsika,* the normalization has otherwise only affected the sandhi. In fact the normalization of sandhi is characteristic of both editions and will not be specifically noted here.

This list is a typical, though not exhaustive, list of forms of probation and suspension that the community can, by formal act, impose on an errant monk. The chief point of interest here may be that if the temporal aspect of the participles *paryuṣita-* and *carita-* continued to be felt then it would appear that even after a monk had undergone probation or "the procedure for becoming agreeable again" he still was denied deference; i.e., was permanently (?) stigmatized. This, however, remains to be demonstrated — for the terms "probation," "procedure for becoming agreeable," and "suspension," see *BHSD* s.v. *parivāsa, mānāpya* and *utkṣipati;* for a very good treatment of the Pāli material see É. Nolot, "Studies in Vinaya Technical Terms I-III," *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 22 (1996) 116-36; Nolot, "Studies in Vinaya Technical Terms IV-X," ib. 25 (1999) 5-37.

I.30Gnoli prints *sarvo gṛhī [sarvaś] cānupasaṃpannaḥ,* but he notes that this is "ex conject." from the Tibetan, which reads: *khyim pa thams cad dang / bsnyen par rdzogs pa ma yin pa thams cad do,* "All lay men and all who are not ordained." He also cites the ms. as reading *sa co gṛihī cānupasaṃpannaḥ* (fol. 942.2), which is exactly what Dutt prints in his edition. **Read:** *sa ca gṛhī cānupasaṃpannaḥ* in spite of the Tibetan.

The rule — one version of which we have here — that a monk must not show deference to a layman (here again *gṛhin*) or to one who was not ordained could, presumably, have created problems for any Mahāyāna group which contained both monk and 'lay bodhisattvas.' The issue was still being discussed as late as Bhavya and Candrakīrti, as Skilling has recently pointed out (P. Skilling, "Citations from the Scriptures of the 'Eighteen Schools' in the *Tarkajvalā*," *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ*, (605-14; esp. 605). Skilling himself says "that the two great 6th century Mādhyamikas felt obliged to deal with the topic shows that it was one of no small importance."

I.31 Gnoli has supplied *[gurukurvanto]* here which both context and the Tibetan indicate has dropped out of the ms.

I.32 This is a cliché of extremely common occurrence; see, for example, *Saṅghabhedavastu* ii 11.4; 12.7; 13.6; 14.12; 16.14; 17.32; 19.29; etc.

I.33 This and all further abbreviations that occur in the translation occur in the text itself — I have introduced no abbreviations of my own. This one, unlike the abbreviation noted in n.10 above, obviously refers to a passage that closely preceded it.

I.34 *vinipatitaśarīra;* i.e. had been reborn as an animal.

II

II.1 For some discussion and a classification of the numerous variant versions of the *jātaka* given here see Ét. Lamotte, "La conduite religieuse du faisan dans les textes bouddhiques," *Le Muséon* 49 (1946) 641-53; for an English translation of the Tibetan translation of our text see F.A. von Schiefner, *Tibetan Tales Derived from Indian Sources* (London: 1882) 302-07. See also, for example, the use of a version of the text by Daoxuan, cited in E. Reinders, "Ritual Topography: Embodiment and Vertical Space in Buddhist Monastic Practice," *History of Religions* 36 (1997) 244 ff; or what appears to be a widespread elaboration of it in Bhutan, B. Crossette, *So Close To Heaven. The Vanishing Buddhist Kingdoms of the Himalayas* (New York: 1995) 199-200 and the photo facing p. 193.

II.2 Gnoli reads *gajaś ca,* and notes that Dutt reads *gajāśvaḥ.* The facsimile is not perfectly clear, but seems to favor Gnoli — certainly the second *-a-* is short (fol. 942.7). If Gnoli is correct then *BHSD*'s entry for *gajāśva* must be cancelled.

II.3 The narrative fact that the animals did not leave what appears to have been a perfectly fine situation alone may point to how deep seated was the Indian cultural notion that social harmony ultimately depends on hierarchy. In any case, this narrative turn which may seem odd to us would almost certainly have made good 'cultural sense' to an Indian audience.

II.4*mayāpy asya dvipatrakasya patreṣv evāvaśyāyabindavo jihvayā nīrlīḍhā iti = kho bos 'di 'i lo ma gnyis skyes pa na / lo ma'i zil ba'i thigs pa lces bldags so* — the translation here is free. Von Schiefner translates the Tibetan: "When the tree had only two leaves, I licked the dew-drops off them with my tongue."

II.5Gnoli in both cases prints *sarveśāṃ* which is, of course, only a misprint. There are in fact a fairly large number of such misprints in this edition, but, since most are obvious, they will not generally be noted here.

II.6*santi tṛṇapuṣpaphalāni saprāṇakāni santi niṣprāṇakāni = lo ma dang / me tog dang / 'bras bu srog chags dang bcas pa yang yod / srog chags med pa yang yod pas /* . L. Schmithausen, *The Problem of the Sentience of Plants in Earliest Buddhism* (Tokyo: 1991) has made it impossible not to be sensitive to the issues that such a passage might raise, but the language here would seem to avoid the many ambiguities. It seems clear enough that grasses, etc, are described here not as themselves being 'living things' but as having 'living things' — even perhaps more specifically "insects" (*BHSD* s.v. *prāṇaka*) — on or in them. Both *saprāṇaka* and *niṣprāṇaka* are used elsewhere, for example, to describe water and in these cases there is agreement on what they mean. *BHSD*, s.v. *prāṇaka*, translates *niṣprāṇakenodakena* as "with water free from insects;" and Schmithausen (p. 53) paraphrases the Pāli *sappāṇakaṃ udakam* with "water containing tiny animate beings (i.e. small animals)."

II.7Both Gnoli and Dutt read the verb here as *prativiramāmaḥ*, but the ms. has *prativiramemaḥ* (fol. 943.4), which can be taken as a regular optative with the *'visarga'* functioning — as it not infrequently does in the Gilgit mss. — as a mark of punctuation; or as an intended optative the form of which was influenced by the preceding *prativiramāmaḥ*. The Tibetan here also points to an optative: *slar ldog par bya'o* (it had, however, the exact same form for the first occurrence of the verb which in the ms. was clearly *prativiramāmaḥ*). Until there is further ms. material **Read**: *prativiramema*.

II.8*saparigraha* and *niṣparigraha* are translated into Tibetan as *yongs su 'dzin pa dang bcas pa* and *'dzin pa med pa*, and both are difficult to translate here since it is highly likely that there is some intentional word-play going on. One of the primary meanings of *pari√grah* is "to fence round, hedge round" and then by extension "to take possession of." Though common usage of *parigraha* tends to pick up on the latter, here, given that the characters involved are browsing animals, the former, more literal sense would almost certainly have been felt as well, if not even more so. For the same reason, a similar invocation of a more primary meaning also seems to be in effect in regard to *mṛṣā* below (see n. 11). "Fenced" is an attempt to represent the first meaning without excluding the second.

II.9In both instances Gnoli and Dutt again read *prativiramāmaḥ*, but the ms. has *prativiramemaḥ* (fol. 943.5;.6) and the Tibetan *slar ldog par bya'o*. In both places **Read** *prativiramema*. Here additional support might be taken from the fact that the verb is part of a *yan nu* construction; see further n. 13 below.

II.10 This bird apparently knew a good deal of *dharmaśāstra* since both *gamyā* and *agamyā* are technical terms frequently found there to designate which women are "fit for cohabitation" and which are not.

II.11 As in the case of *parigraha* (see n.7), here again the text seems to be playing with the technical meaning of *mṛṣāvāda* and a more etymological meaning. *mṛṣāvāda* is as a moral fault generally taken to mean "lying," but it first of all may mean "speaking to no purpose, uselessly," and the further description here — *yadvā tadvā vipralapāmaḥ* — makes it abundantly clear that that is the sense our author wants to be primary here. The Tibetan takes it mechanically as "lying," *brdzun du smra ba.*

II.12 Here the ms. itself has *prativiramāmaḥ*, but probably by scribal error. **Read** *prativiramema.*

II.13 *vratapada = brtul zhugs kyi gzhi.*

II.14 The verb here is *pratiṣṭhāpayāmaḥ*, a present, even though constructed with *yan nu,* and even though the Tibetan again points to an optative. In fact all of the verbs in what follows where the individual animals declare their intentions for the future are, in the ms., indicatives, but in the Tibetan 'futures,' *rab tu dgod par bya.* Without emending I still follow the Tibetan in translating. *BHSD* s.v. *yan (yaṃ) nu* gives: "conj., suppose, now, with opt. of 1st person," and although it notes under *yan (yaṃ) nūna* that this "rarely" occurs with the indicative, and that Pāli *yan nūna* is recorded with both the future and the indicative, in addition to the optative, *BHSD* does not refer to our passages.

II.15 The text here is uncertain. Gnoli reads by emendation *yady evam etat saṃkṣepād,* citing the Tibetan: *gal te de lta na mdor na khyed kyis 'dul ba ma yin pa...* Dutt, also citing the Tibetan, reads *yady evam etat tu saṃkṣepaya...* Neither notes the ms. reading, and the facsimile is not clear enough here to be certain of its reading (fol. 944.1).

II.16 Gnoli reads *avinayā,* which is what the ms. appears to have (fol. 944.1); Dutt reads *avinīyā. BHSG* 219 s.v. *nī* cites Dutt's reading as a gerundive, but suspects an error: "...not to be disciplined (if not error for *avineya* or *avinīta*)" (see also its § 34.27). The facsimile is clear enough to say that there is no *-i-*, short or long, in the third syllable. Tibetan is of no help here: *'dul ba ma yin pa.*

II.17 Dutt here and below reads *saṃprajānavihāriṇo*, but Gnoli — both times with the ms. (fol. 944.2 & .5) — *saṃprajanadvihāriṇo;* cf. *BHSG* § 18.53.

II.18 *anubhāvād* = *mthus*, a deceptively difficult term to translate and one of some moment. E. Conze, *Materials for a Dictionary of the Prajñāpāramitā Literature* (Tokyo: 1967) 40 gives simply "might;" J. Nobel, *Suvarṇaprabhāsottamasūtra. Das Goldglanz-Sūtra. Ein Sanskrittext des Mahāyāna-Buddhismus. Die Tibetischen Übersetzungen mit einem Wörterbuch* (Leiden: 1950) Bd. II. 93, although defining the Tibetan *mthu,* gives a much better idea of the range of ideas involved: "Macht, Stärke, magische Kraft, Gnade." In Sanskrit sources it is frequently found in association with the Buddha himself in the form *buddhānubhāvena,* and has crucial bearing on how this figure was understood (see III n. 3 below for an example). It is therefore curious that little attention has

been paid to it. At a minimum, the term seems to refer to the power, force or ability to effect and affect things which are external to oneself — people, events, etc. It appears to be as much magical as moral, and in fact overlaps and is sometimes paired with *ṛddhi*. See also below XIV n. 15 where *anubhāva* is used in regard to an object.

II.19 There is almost certainly a scribal omission here and Gnoli has rightly restored [*kathayanti: asmākam eṣo 'nubhāvaḥ*] on the basis of the Tibetan, although it might better be... *'nubhāva iti*.

II.20 *naimittika* = *ltas mkhan rnams*.

II.21 It is probably too easy to read too much into this little exchange, but note that the king responds to the information that there are powerful — we might say religiously powerful — beings in his kingdom by resolving to go and "see" them, and this, of course, was and remains a common Indian mode of 'worship' or contact with the religiously powerful. But the *Ṛṣi's* response, then, could also represent an equally typical Indian critique of worship. It, in effect, puts *pratipatti*, "practice," above *pūjā*. This is an old debate in Indian Buddhist sources here, perhaps, tucked into a little *jātaka*.

II.22 This is the first time that the king is given a name. Brahmadatta is, of course, the name of the 'mythical' king in whose reign all stories of the past about which there are any uncertainties must be placed, at least according to a rule found in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. In fact more than four-fifths of the 547 *jātakas* found in the Pāli *Jātaka* collection are so placed; see G. Schopen, "If You Can't Remember, How to Make It Up: Some Monastic Rules for Redacting Canonical Texts," in *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ. Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, ed. P. Kieffer-Pülz & J.-U. Hartmann (Swisttal Odendorf: 1997) 571-82.

II.23 *kāyasya bhedāt* = *lus zhig nas*. This is of course a common idiom, but it is still worth noting that its very commonness might be important if the idiom is carrying with it the belief that one is not actually reborn until after the physical body is destroyed. There are other texts in our *Vinaya* where, for example, a dead monk is reborn even before his body is removed from his cell (Schopen, *BSBM* 209-211), so the whole question needs to be sorted out.

II.24 Gnoli notes that the *ca punar* in this phrase which occurs in the ms. (fol. 945.2) is not represented in the Tibetan and is perhaps to be expunged. Since, in addition, it makes for an awkward construction I have in effect done so, and do not translate it.

II.25 Gnoli notes that Dutt reads here *tayor vane*, but not that this is clearly a misreading.

II.26 Dutt reads with the ms. *kapiñjalaṃ brahmacaryaṃ* (fol. 945.2), but the Tibetan here — as well as grammatical requirements — point to a genitive compound: *gong ma sregs kyi tshangs spyod pa*, and so have I taken it, emending, with Gnoli, to *kapiṃjalabrahmacaryaṃ*.

II.27 For the presence of *jātakas* and *avadānas* in *vinaya* texts see the Introduction. Here note as well that when *jātakas* like "The Jātaka of the Partridge" are read as *vinaya* it is easy to see how they could

inculcate monastic rules and beliefs which might otherwise be awkward to more directly express. If it is clear, for example, in our *jātaka* that there is an intended equation between its animals and the community of monks, then the effects of their similar behaviors must also be the same, and the strong sub-text here must be that rains in their proper season and agricultural regularity and abundance are effected by the proper behavior of the monks themselves — this is a powerful message, if not a heady belief, but it is not difficult to imagine that some monks might well have held and actively promoted it.

II.28 *sabhayavaśavartin = 'jigs pa'i dbang du 'gro ba dang bcas pa.* Although on one level what this means is pretty clear it is hard to know how to properly nuance it. *bhaya, 'jigs pa,* most straightforwardly means "fear, alarm, dread, apprehension" — see for example the common phrase applied to a 'good' monk: *aṇumātreṣv avadyeṣu bhayadarśī, Saṅghabhedavastu* ii 232.8; *aṇumattesu vajjesu bhaya-dassāvī, Dīgha* i 63.15, "looking with dread/fear at even the smallest of reproaches." Though at first sight it might seem odd that a monk might have, and need to control, fears, apprehensions or dread in regard to his fellow-monks, once it is admitted that in dealing with Buddhist monks we are dealing with people —and this is too commonly forgotten — in fact with celibate males living in close quarters with a strong hierarchical pecking order, then the acknowledgement of such a need has a certain ring of truth and practical wisdom.

II.29 *sabrahmacārin = tshangs pa mtshungs par spyod pa.* This is a term that is common enough but the exact boundaries of the group it designates are not easy to establish. At *Cīvaravastu,* GMs iii 2, 119.8, for example, when the Monk Upananda dies in Śrāvastī and the king is about to confiscate his estate the Buddha asserts the monastic rights to it by saying, in part, *sabrahmacāriṇāṃ eṣa labhaḥ prāpadyate,* "this acquisition falls to his fellow-monks." In the same text after the monks of Śrāvastī had already divided the estate monks from Sāketa hear about it and come to claim a share, saying *asmākam api bhadantopanandaḥ sabrahmacārī / asmākam api tatsantako lābhaḥ prāpadyata iti,* "The reverend Upananda was also our fellow-monk. The acquisitions belonging to him also fall to us;" and monks from the other four great cities — Vaiśāli, Vārāṇaṣī, Rājagṛha and Campā — also come and make the same claim. Here at least there is no geographical limitation on the term, nor any reference to 'parishes' *(sīmā)* — these monks are from completely different and distant cities and yet all claim to be "fellow-monks." That claim is moreover, not contested in the text. Whether or not this usage is standard or the dominant one has yet to be fully established.

II.30 *sthavira, madhya* (*bar ma*), *navaka* (*gsar bu*). Whether in contexts like the present one these terms are simple adjectives, or designations for formally recognized categories of monks, is not entirely clear. They obviously refer to relative seniority, but apart from the first they — like *sabrahmacārin* — appear to lack clear boundaries. *navaka,* for example, is defined by association with *ādikarmika,* "beginner," and *acirapravrajita,* "one who has only recently entered the religious life," in the *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛccha* (Finot) 5.1, and *Vinaya* sources are generally no more precise, except in regard to *sthavira,* and even here the details are not always clear. For further references to *sthaviras* and some of their functions see below XXIII (37.7) and XXVI (39.6). For a long enumeration of the duties (*bya ba*) of a *sthavira* in a variety of situations see *Uttaragrantha,* Derge Pa 280a.7ff; there are also sets of duties for both *madhyas* and *navakas* given there (300b.5ff).

II.31*āsamudācārikān dharmān. āsamudācārika* with *dharma,* almost always plural, has a very specific referent. They are sets of rules—always delivered by the same stereotyped formula—that are required of a monk, in addition to the *prātimokṣa* rules, when he is fulfilling a specific, and often temporary, monastic office or function, or has undertaken a specific task or action. The *Śayanāsanavastu* itself delivers two sets of such rules—the rules of customary behavior for the monk who is the keeper of the monastery's dogs (XXV (38.30)), and for the monk acting as "the giver of explanations" (XXXIII (47.18)) — and they represent something of the range and diversity of functions that such rules cover. These sets, moreover, occur in all parts of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, as some further examples will make clear: in the *Poṣadhavastu* (Hu-von Hinüber) §§ 18-23.3 there is a set governing the monk in charge of religious exertion (*prahāṇapratijāgrako bhikṣur*); in the *Pārivāsikavastu,* GMs iii 3, 96.19ff, a set governing monks who are under probation (see G. Schopen, "Marking Time in Buddhist Monasteries. On Calendars, Clocks, and Some Liturgical Practices," in *Sūryacandrāya. Essays in Honour of Akira Yuyama on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday,* ed. P. Harrison & G. Schopen (Swisttal-Odendorf: 1998) esp. 157-61); in the *Cīvara-vastu,* GMs iii 2, 90.8ff, they govern a monk with leprosy. In the *Vibhaṅga,* we find such rules for monks who do construction work (Derge Ca 146a 2ff), for a monk who cuts down a tree when he is acting as a *navakarmika* (Derge Cha 279b.3ff), for how a monk who is travelling must deal with his baggage, (Derge Ca 78a.4ff), or for the Elder of the Community in regard to preparations for a recitation of the Dharma (Derge Ca 157a); in the *Kṣudrakavastu* we find them for monks in charge of the monastery's orchards (Derge Tha 234a.3ff), for monks who wear perfume for medical reasons (Derge Tha 4a.7ff), etc. Such sets of rules are, in brief, extremely common, but our passage is one of the few which indicates the value placed on them: regardless of what modern scholars might make of these rules, monastic authors themselves—to judge by our passage—held that their fulfillment, and the fulfillment of the *śaikṣā* rules (see next note), were foundational to, and essential for, the achievement of final *nirvāṇa,* the highest religious goal. Without their fulfillment this simply was not possible. The fact that they are not commonly so valued by modern scholars may be a good indication of how far removed we are from the monastic authors that we try to understand.

II.32*śaikṣān dharmān.* As in the case of the *āsamudācārika* rules, the reference here to the *śaikṣa* rules almost certainly has a specific referent. It almost certainly refers to the rules in the penultimate section of the various *Prātimokṣas.* There are 108 rules in the Mūlasarvāstivādin version of this section, and they have generally been taken as the least important of the *Prātimokṣa* rules. This, however, may be off the mark in at least two ways. First, our passage suggests that they—again like the *āsamudācarika* rules—were considered foundational and essential to any higher religious achievement. They are, moreover, the only rules in the *Prātimokṣa* specifically mentioned here. Second, the *śaikṣa* rules are often dismissed as 'late' and of little historical interest because they are the least uniform of the *Prātimokṣa* rules in the various versions of the *Prātimokṣa.* But this same lack of uniformity may in fact suggest that they are historically the most important of the rules since they are the least levelled or homogenized, and therefore the most likely to allow us to define the differences between the various monastic orders.

II.33*-skandha*; i.e. *śīla-skandha, samādhi-skandha,* etc.

II.34 *vimukti-*.

II.35 There is what appears to be an extra *sthānam etad vidyate* in the ms. It could be either the first or the last, depending on how one chooses to structure the text. The ms. reads...*parinirvāsyati / nedaṃ sthānam vidyate / sthānam etad vidyate / sa tāvad*...(fol. 945.6) and both marks of punctuation are in the ms. itself. If we read in this way the final occurrence of the phrase (the fifth in the ms.) should then either be deleted or, taken as a repetition, standing by itself, for emphasis. If the first occurrence in the ms. is to be deleted then the structure of the second paragraph here would be the same as that of the first; i.e. the statement about possibility would come at the end of the individual statements in both. Both Gnoli and Dutt have omitted the first occurrence of *sthānam etad vidyate* that is found in the ms., but neither gives any indication that they have done so or that the phrase is there. The Tibetan structures both paragraphs in the same way and translates only four occurrences of the phrase. I have followed it, with some hesitation.

II.36 *tasmāt tarhi bhikṣava evaṃ śikṣitavyam...ity evaṃ vo bhikṣavaḥ śikṣitavyam*. In a *Vinaya* text addressed to monks and dealing with monastic issues this exhortation is of course perfectly at home. It is therefore of some interest to note, for example, that only a very few of the hundred *avadānas* in the *Avadānaśataka* do not end with the same exhortation, either in its full form (*tasmāt tarhi bhikṣava evaṃ śikṣitavyaṃ...ity evaṃ vo bhikṣavaḥ śikṣitavyam* — nos. 1, 11-36, 38, 40), or in a shortened form (*ity evaṃ vo bhikṣavaḥ śikṣitavyam* — most of the rest, with nos. 2-10 the only notable block of exceptions). This too would seem to mark this collection of *avadānas* as a work intended for and addressed to monks; cf. n. 27 above.

III

III.1 The facsimile here is hard to read (fol. 945.9). Both Gnoli and Dutt seem to have read *takṣūṇāṃ*, the former printing *ta[ra]kṣūṇām*, the latter — without any indication that he was emending — *tarakṣūṇāṃ*. The *akṣara* both read as *-kṣū-* does not look much like that to me, and the Tibetan translators clearly saw something else in their text. They translate *chom rkun pa rnams*, "thieves." Since *taskara*, "thief," is an attested equivalent for *chom rkun* the text used by the Tibetan translators could well have had *taskarāṇām*, and this may also have been intended by our scribe. Still, given the uncertainties, I follow Gnoli.

III.2 I have not translated *vihāra* = *gtsug lag khang* here or elsewhere in the text. It is commonly translated by "monastery," but such a rendering is misleading and conceals the fact that the precise nature of the structures that are referred to by the term is, in most cases, not actually determinable. The term in fact — as, for example, our passage makes abundantly clear — is applied to a wide range of structures of various sizes and configurations. (For a similar problem in regard to the term "monastery" in Western medieval sources see G. Schopen, "Ritual Rights and Bones of Contention: More on Monastic Funerals and Relics in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*," *JIP* 22 (1994) 74 n. 26). How vague the term is can be seen in the definition it is given in the *Vibhaṅga* (Derge Ca 249b.3): "*vihāra* means: where there is room for the four bodily postures — walking, standing, sitting and

lying down." The history of Buddhist monastic architecture is, moreover, especially in its early periods, badly understood; (see G. Schopen, "Doing Business for the Lord: Lending on Interest and Written Loan Contracts in the *Mūlasarvastivādavinaya*," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 114 (1994) esp. 547ff), and for this reason, if no other, it is worth noting that in our passage the *vihāra* has not yet been reduced to what became a single quadrangular type (cf. Ét. Lamotte, *Histoire du bouddhisme indien. Des origines à l'ère śaka* (Louvain: 1958) 197).

III.3 *devatābhir apy evaṃ bhagavata ārocitam.* This statement is of interest because it seems to imply that its author may have thought that the Buddha's 'vision' needed confirmation. For some further instances where the Buddha knows or acts in concert with *devatā* or gods see the account of Pūrṇa found in our *Vinaya* where a miracle occurs *buddhānāṃ buddhānubhavena devatānāṃ ca devatānubhāvena, Divyāvadāna* 43.25 = Derge Ka 309b.1 (but note the plurality of Buddhas here); *Divyāvadāna* 147.23; 151.4; 162.27 (although the relationship of the Sanskrit text here to the Tibetan version in the *Vinaya* has yet to be worked out); *Avadānaśataka* (Speyer) i 9.11; 24.10; etc. A full study of such passages could be of great interest. Cf. Granoff, "The Ambiguity of Miracles," 31.

III.4 The name in its first occurrence here is given as *kalyāṇabhadra,* but below as *kalyāṇabhadrika.* I have adopted the former throughout. A *kalyāṇabhadra* or *-bhadrika* does not seem to be known elsewhere, and this too may be an indication of the relative age of our passage — in the corresponding text in the Pāli *Vinaya* (ii 146 ff) the corresponding character is a nameless "merchant" (*seṭṭhi*) from Rājagṛha. This is the first instance in our text of a named *gṛhapati,* a title I have conventionally translated as "householder." J. Nattier, however, has rightly pointed out to me that the full implications of the title *gṛhapati* are still not clear and that — although this is rarely noted — it remains problematic. She prefers to render it as "eminent householder," and such a rendering has merit although it would still leave the problem of what any such eminence is based on. When *gṛhapatis* are further characterized — and that is not very often — it is usually in terms of their wealth. This is the case, for example, in regard to Datta, Anāthapiṇḍada's father, in IV below, and in regard to the father of the girl that Anāthapiṇḍada secures as a wife for his seventh son in V. In fact the old commentary embedded in the *Vibhaṅga* actually glosses the term *gṛhapati* as "a rich man' (*khyim bdag gam zhes bya ba ni phyug pa'o,* Derge Cha 125a.5 — *phyug pa* regularly translates *āḍhya*). But there are problems here as well. The fact that only some *gṛhapatis,* like Datta, are additionally characterized as very wealthy might of necessity imply that all were not; and the same old commentary that glosses the term in one place as "a rich man," elsewhere glosses it simply as "a man" (*khyim bdag ces bya ba ni skyes pa'o,* Derge Cha 118a.2).

III.5 *kuśalamūlapratibodhitasantater = dge ba'i rtsa ba des sems kyi rgyud bskal nas.*

III.6 *anujānīyād* and *anujānāmi.* Forms of *anu√jñā* are extremely common in our *Vinaya* but are used almost exclusively in regard to persons of authority, and usually of clear legal authority — kings (*Carmavastu,* GMs iii 4, 191.13, .15), parents (*Paṇḍulohitakavastu,* GMs iii 3, 20.10), but above all, as here, the Buddha. They are, again, deceptively difficult to translate. Bechert has noted that "most *Vinaya* interpreters down to the present day have translated the word *anujānāmi* as 'I permit,' 'I allow,' both of which are incorrect in this context [he is talking about a statement of the Buddha very much

like the one in our passage]: it means 'I order' here" (H. Bechert, "The Laws of the Buddhist Sangha: An Early Juridical System in Indian Tradition," *Hokke-Bunka Kenkyū* 19 (1993) 7). Earlier the same author had said: "Unfortunately, some authors still translate *anujānāmi* in most passages in the *Vinayapiṭaka* with 'I allow.' However, when the Buddha speaks, the appropriate translation in most cases is 'I prescribe'" (H. Bechert, "The Importance of Aśoka's So-Called Schism Edict," in *Indological and Buddhist Studies. Volume in Honour of Professor J.W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. L.A. Hercus et al (Canberra: 1982) 63). The general purport of Bechert's remarks is almost certainly correct, but even he, obviously, wavered in his choice of exactly the right word that was to be used in translation. And for good reason: one's choice here will, to a surprisingly large degree, determine the "tone" of most of the *Vinaya.* Though not entirely convinced that it is the best choice, I have still adopted Bechert's "order." Needless to say, the same choice confronts a translator of the Pāli *Vinaya.*

III.7 *layana* = *gnas khang.* As with *vihāra* and almost all the architectural terms here, the concrete referent of *layana* is not certain. In contexts like the present it is commonly, and probably correctly, taken to refer to a residential cell or room in a *vihāra.* It is, however, not difficult to find usages where this sense does not work smoothly. In the Pāli text which seems to correspond to ours *vihāra* is given as the first of five kinds of *lena* (=Skt. *layana*).

III.8 *gandhakuṭi* = *dri gtsang khang* — always so spelled here. Of all the architectural terms here *gandhakuṭi* may be the least problematic. Originally it seems to have referred to a special structure or cell reserved for the use of the Buddha in the Jetavana; then it came to refer to the central cell of any *vihāra* that was to be occupied by the Buddha — in later times in the form of his image (for both inscriptional and textual references, see G. Schopen, "The Buddha as an Owner of Property and Permanent Resident in Medieval Indian Monasteries," *JIP* 18 (1990) 181-217 [= *BSBM* 258-89] to which numerous further references in our *Vinaya* could easily be added). But even here there are cases which seem not to correspond to standard usage: at *Uttaragrantha,* Derge, Derge Pa 119b.2, for example, we find...*mchod rten la mtha' ma dri gtsang khang gis bskor la...*, which would seem to suggest that a *stūpa* was to be encircled by a border of *gandhakuṭis*, and may be referring to something like what Marshall found at the Dharmarājika at Taxila (see J. Marshall, *Taxila* (Cambridge: 1951) Vol. III, pl. 45); and at *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge Tha 176a.1 the *gandhakuṭi* seems to have been a free standing structure that — like an image or the pole of a *stūpa* — could cast a shadow (monks are there told that they could step on the shadow cast by any of the three after reciting "a verse of the Ṛṣi").

III.9 *dvārakoṣṭhaka* = *sgo khang;* cf. *BHSD* s.v. and below VIII n. 20. I assume that *triśāla* or "three sided" refers to a *vihāra* like those whose ground-plans are illustrated as nos. 15 or 21 on pl. XIII in H. Sarkar, *Studies in Early Buddhist Architecture of India*, 2nd ed. (New Delhi: 1993) from Nāgārjunakoṇḍa. They would have been like a quadrangular *vihāra,* but with an open 'front' and therefore lacking a *dvārakoṣṭhaka.*

III.10 *pura* = *rtseg.* Another difficult term. Hu-von Hinüber translates it as "Raum" with no discussion (*Poṣadhavastu* (Hu-von Hinüber) § 13.1); *BHSD* gives "upper chamber," following, it

says, the Tibetan, and I have followed it elsewhere (Schopen, "Doing Business for the Lord," 529); to judge by Gernet the Chinese understood it to refer to "étages" (J. Gernet, *Les aspects économiques du bouddhisme dans la société chinoise du v^e au x^e siècle* (Paris: 1956) 156 — which appears in the recent English translation as "stories," J. Gernet, *Buddhism in Chinese Society. An Economic History from the Fifth to the Tenth Centuries*, trans. F. Verellen (New York: 1995) 160). *Poṣadhavastu* (Hu-von Hinüber) § 13.1-.3 makes it clear that without stairs access to a *pura* was difficult, and that once reached monks could fall off it, prompting the Buddha to require a railing. *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge Tha 158b.2-.5 also indicates that stairs were required to reach a *pura* and adds that "from the ground floor there are two doors" allowing access. Both the *Vibhaṅga* (Derge Cha 154b.3ff) and the *Uttaragrantha* (Derge Pa 178a.1ff) indicate that the presence of *puras* led to the collapse of the structures they were built on, the latter specifically indicating that this was due to their weight (*steng gi lcid kyis rtsig pa 'jig tu byed de*), leading the Buddha to order that the number of *pura* could be reduced. The prescribed number is in any case not uniform in all passages.

III.11 *bālāgrapotika* = *sgo khang steng gi bsil khang*. The translation here — like the definition in *BHSD* — is entirely based on a rather mechanical understanding of the Tibetan.

III.12 The rule here that a *vihāra* for nuns must be architecturally inferior to a *vihāra* for monks by having — whatever *pura* and *bālāgrapotika* mean — less monumental or architectonic development is consistent. It is found with varying detail here in the *Śayanāsanavastu*, in the *Vibhaṅga* (Derge Cha 154b.3), the *Kṣudrakavastu* (Derge Tha 158b.2), the *Uttaragrantha* (Derge Pa 178a.1), probably in the *Bhikṣuṇīvibhaṅga* (Derge Ta 222a.5), and at *Vinayasūtra* (Sankrityayana) 112.22. In many instances — e.g. *Vibhaṅga*, Derge Cha 154b.3 — the residence of nuns is not even allowed the title *vihāra*, but is called a *varṣaka* = *dbyar khang*, a "retreat house" (for some further examples see *Vibhaṅga*, Derge Ja 91a.3; *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge Tha 112a.3; 113a.3; Da 139a.5; 173a.5; *Uttaragrantha*, Derge Pa 86a.3; .7; etc.) It is particularly unfortunate that nunneries are not, in spite of this rule, visible in the archaeological record, or at least none have as yet been definitively identified. It is not impossible that the failure to identify nunneries is at least in part a result of not looking in the right places. There are, for example, incidental references that would seem to suggest that *varṣakas* were — unlike *vihāras* — located within towns or cities. At *Vibhaṅga*, Derge Ja 103b.1ff, to cite one instance, the text first says that the monk Udāyin entered Śrāvastī for alms, but then it says: "While making the round for alms in Śrāvastī he came to where the retreat house for nuns was "(*mnyan yod du bsod snyoms la rgyu ba na dge slong ma'i dbyar khang ga la ba der song ngo*) In light of such passages it may be possible to rethink the intra-urban *stūpas* and their associated 'house' found at Sirkap, or even the so-called "House of Naradakha" at Shaikhan Dheri (for convenience see for both F.R. Allcin, *The Archaeology of Early Historic South Asia. The Emergence of Cities and States* (Cambridge: 1995) 283, 288 and references there). These could just as easily have been such *varṣakas*. (*BHSD* has not noted the close association between *varṣakas* and nuns.)

IV

IV.1 No other *vihāra* has anything like the importance of the Jetavana in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and this explains, in part, why so much space in our text is devoted to the story of its founding and the biography of its 'founder.' It was, quite literally, the model for all other *vihāras.* In the *Saṅghabhedavastu,* for example, when the monk Udāyin tells King Śuddhodana that the Buddha will be returning to Kapilavastu, and that the Buddha makes his residence in a forest or in a *vihāra,* the king says *ka evaṃvidho vihāra iti,* "But of what sort is a *vihāra*?" Then the text says *āyuṣmatā udāyinā jetavanākārena likhitvā darśitaḥ:* "When the venerable Udāyin had drawn one with the plan of the Jetavana he showed it to him (i.e. the king)." Having seen it the king orders his ministers to build sixteen large *vihāras* with exactly the same plan (*jetavanākareṇa ṣodaśamahallakān vihārān māpayata — Saṅghabhedavastu* i 186-87). Interestingly, the Jetavana was still functioning as the model or "ideal" monastery in Tang China — though now it looked like a Chinese palace complex (see Puay-peng Ho, "The Ideal Monastery: Daoxuan's Description of the Central Indian Jetavana," *East Asian History* 10 (1995) 1-18; N. Shatzman Steinhardt, "Early Chinese Buddhist Architecture and Its Indian Origins," in *The Flowering of a Foreign Faith. New Studies in Chinese Buddhist Art,* ed. J. Baker (Mumbai: 1998) 38-53.) Whether our text was known to Daoxuan is unknown. His work was written in 667 so I-Ching's translation of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* would have been done after Daoxuan. But a text with strong affinities to ours was, however, done into Chinese already in 445 CE — this was the chapter entitled "Sudatta Erects a Monastery" in the Chinese version of *The Sūtra on the Wise and the Foolish.* This chapter has recently been translated into English twice (W. Brown, "From Sūtra to Pien-wen: A Study of 'Sudatta Erects a Monastery' and the Hsiang-mo Pien-wen" *Tamkang Review* 9 (1978) 67-101; and V.H. Mair, *The Linguistic and Textual Antecedents of the Sūtra of the Wise and the Foolish* (Sino-Platonic Papers 38) (Philadelphia: 1993) — the latter makes no mention of the former). A glance at either, in comparison with our text, will show the sometimes strong similarities of the Chinese version with what we have here in Sanskrit.

It was not, however, just the Jetavana itself that was famous. A tradition that Anāthapiṇḍada had purchased the land on which it came to stand by covering it with 'gold' also seems to have been widespread and old. It is, for example, represented several times in the very earliest Buddhist narrative art, at Bharhut (R.C. Sharma, *Bharhut Sculptures* (New Delhi: 1994) 24-25; H. Lüders, *Bharhut Inscriptions* (Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum II.2) (Ootacamund: 1963) 105; pls. XIX, XXXVIII), at Bodh-gaya (K.K. Chakravarty, *Early Buddhist Art of Bodh-Gayā* (New Delhi: 1997) pl. 11), and at Amarāvatī (see Schlingloff, *Studies in the Ajanta Paintings,* 245-46 and Ch 24 fig 24).

But — as will become clear below — the redactors of our *Vinaya* appear to have been aware of more than just the importance of the Jetavana and the tradition about its purchase. As has already been signalled in the Introduction, there are good indications that they were also aware of the fact that there was something odd — if not, indeed, illegal — about the way in which the land for this famous *vihāra* had been acquired. They may, in short, have received an account of its 'purchase' which they knew was not in accord with Indian law, and this too may account, in part, for the amount of space they devoted to it.

IV.2The word for "pregnant" in this cliché (see next note) is of some interest in terms of what is often presented as more formal Buddhist doctrine: *āpanna-sattvā* = *sems can dang ldan par gyur nas*, "one into whom a *sattva* has entered."

IV.3From the beginning of IV up to this point the text is made up of several set phrases or narrative clichés which occur throughout and characterize Mūlasarvāstivādin literary sources — the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya, Avadānaśataka, Divyāvadāna.* While much could be gained by the systematic collection and analysis of these narrative formulae, there seems little point in citing random samplings so, for the most part, I have refrained from doing so in the following notes, and simply mark such passages as clichés. Here as an example of the extent of such formulae, and only that, one might look at *Avadāna-çataka* (Feer) 3-4 ("Lieux communs bouddhiques" nos. 6,7,9); C. Vogel & K. Wille, *Some Hitherto Unidentified Fragments of the Pravrajyāvastu Portion of the Vinayavastu Manuscript Found Near Gilgit* (Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. I. Philologisch-Historische Klasse. Jg. 1984 Nr. 7) (Göttingen: 1984) 312; G. Schopen, "Deaths, Funerals, and the Division of Property in a Monastic Code," in *Buddhism in Practice*, ed. D.S. Lopez, Jr. (Princeton: 1995) 488, 498, 500; J. Tatelman, *The Glorious Deeds of Pūrṇa* (Richmond, Surrey: 2000) 46, 48.

IV.4Spoken, I assume, with irony and irritation, like American English "What a fine mess!"

IV.5Dutt reads *sudatto* and this is the reading found in the ms. (fol. 947.1), but both the Tibetan (*sbyin ba*) and context make it clear that this is a scribal error for *datta.* Gnoli has recognized this and emended accordingly.

IV.6*nadī grāhākulā* = *'bab chu ni chu srin 'dzin khris gang ba yin pas.* Sanskrit *grāha* could, of course, refer to an actual animal. Monier-Williams s.v. gives "a rapacious animal living in fresh or sea water, any large fish or marine animal (crocodile, shark, serpent, Gangetic alligator, etc." But unless I am much mistaken what we have here is just another case of a parent trying to scare his child with a story about monsters. Notice that *vipralambhayitum*, which I have translated here as "to cajole," means more commonly and strongly "to deceive."

IV.7*putra tava doṣo 'sti* = *bu khyod la nyes pa yod do* — see n. 12 below.

IV.8As Gnoli has already signalled, the Tibetan is fuller here: *yab bdag la nongs pa ci 'dra ba zhig mchis*, "But, Father, what have I done wrong?"

IV.9The reading here is uncertain. The facsimile seems to have *kiṃ tāto dravyeṇārthī putra ka* (possibly *ko*) *nārthī* (fol. 947.3); Dutt reads: *kiṃ tāto dravyeṇārthī putrake nārthi;* Gnoli has *kiṃ tāto dravyeṇārthī ? putra ko' nārthī*, citing A as *dravyeṇārthī putrakeṇārthī*, but the latter is not the reading of either Dutt or the ms. The Tibetan here is: *yab ci nor don du gnyer lags sam / bu su zhig don du mi gnyer /* , but since *nor* more commonly translates *dhana* — as it does in what immediately follows — this may suggest a slightly different text. For the second sentence **Read:** *putra ko nārthī.*

IV.10 Ms. (fol. 947.5), Gnoli and Dutt all read *dānapati-*, but Tibetan has *nor gyi bdag po,* which points to *dhanapati,* and this would seem better suited to the context. Moreover, everywhere else in the Tibetan version of our text *dānapati* is rendered by either *yon bdag* or *sbyin bdag.* With some hesitation **Read**: *dhanapati.*

IV.11 Dutt reads *satyam* and this is what the ms. appears to have (fol. 947.4), but Gnoli has already recognized that this must be a scribal error for *śakyam,* which is both required by the infinitive construction and supported by the Tibetan: *btang bar nus so.*

IV.12 Without some sensitivity to Indian cultural norms and expectations it will probably not be immediately obvious what issues are being addressed here. First of all it is necessary to keep in mind that Indian story or narrative literature is, as already noted in the Introduction, very often far more sophisticated than it might at first sight seem, and is often particularly concerned with 'legal correctness.' Our narrative is no exception, but in presenting Sudatta as a munificent donor from his early childhood our narrative could not avoid the cultural 'fact' that his actions, under normal circumstances, would have been in direct conflict with Indian law and cultural expectation. *Manu* 8.119, for example, says that any gift given by one who does not own it is invalid; *Nārada* 1.38, that "a transaction done by one who is not independent is invalid;" and in 1.31-32 it says further that as long as his parents are alive a child is not independent "no matter how old he is" (R.W. Lariviere, *The Nāradasmṛti, Part II* (Philadelphia: 1989) 43; 40) — that our author was familiar with such ideas is signalled by his insertion of the "established rule" that almost immediately follows. In other words, the actions of the young Sudatta — far from being exemplary — would have appeared culturally reprehensible, and this too is signalled by our author when he has Datta explicitly declare the "fault" (*doṣa*) in his son's behavior. But our author also very cleverly resolves the conflict with two further legal points. Sudatta in our text was able to find "hoards" or *nidhis*, but *nidhi* is an established legal term, and at least a part of any *nidhi* belongs to its finder (*Manu* 8.35-.39; *Nārada* 7.6-.7; Sternbach, *Juridical Studies in Ancient Indian Law*, ii 4ff.). Since, however, Sudatta's minority status might still compromise this, Datta's permission to "make gifts as you please" (*yatheṣṭam),* is a far more definitive solution — the ability to do as one pleases with property is, in both Roman and Indian law, "the defining characteristic of absolute possession or ownership" (G. Schopen, "The Lay Ownership of Monasteries and the Role of the Monk in Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasticism," *JIABS* 19.1 (1996) 87 and n. 18). A high degree of legal awareness and sophistication is evident throughout the *Śayanāsanavastu.*

V

V.1 The text in both Gnoli and Dutt is almost certainly misparagraphed here. The statement starting *dharmatā hy eṣā* and ending *jīvatīti* should not end the previous paragraph, but — as given in the translation — head the following one. This is confirmed when the statement is recognized for what it is. It is what might be called, for lack of a better term, an editorial insertion. Such insertions are common in and even characteristic of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya.* They are generalizing statements that are syntactically isolated from the passages that they are inserted into which explain to the reader

— in effect tell him how to read — both what has preceeded and, more commonly, what follows them. They are often directed towards points which might otherwise cause problems. In the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, GMs iii 1, 83.4, for example, when Mahākāśyapa does not initially recognize Śakra, who has disguised himself as a poor weaver, and just at the point where a reader or hearer might be expected to ask himself how a great *arhat* could not have known what was going on, the following generalizing statement is inserted: "This, indeed, is the established rule: 'without having first focused his mind, knowledge and vision do not arise for an *arhat*.'" And then, the text says, Kāśyapa goes on to focus his mind and comes to know that the weaver is Śakra himself. In the *Pravrajyāvastu*, to cite another example, just before a boy kills his mother — a culturally shocking act that an Indian reader or hearer might well be expected to find hard to believe — a syntactically isolated general statement occurs: "Surely, for one who indulges the passions there is no evil act that is not to be done'" (GMs iii 4,55.5 — Dutt has not recognized the parenthetical nature of this and several other statements in his text here). Although most such insertions pick up on what precedes them in the narrative, their main function seems to be to instruct the reader or hearer as to how the following action is to be understood or came about, and they are therefore overwhelmingly often placed at the head of that action. In our present case the editorial assertion picks up on the legal questions that preceded it, but more fully legitimates what follows it: Sudatta got his reputation and new name as a result of his behavior *after* he had become a legal person and therefore an unproblematic donor. A very similar editorial insertion, in virtually the same context, occurs in the biography of Jyotiṣka in the *Kṣudrakavastu*, a Sanskrit text for which is now preserved in the *Divyāvadāna: ācaritam etallokasya na tāvat putrasya nāma prajñāyate yāvat pitā jīvati. yāvad apareṇa samayena subhadro gṛhapatiḥ kālagataḥ / jyotiṣkaḥ kumāraḥ svagṛhe pratiṣṭhitaḥ...*(*Divyāvadāna* 274.7).

V.2 *gṛhasvāmin* — a very good parallel in both form and implication for the important Buddhist term *vihārasvāmin*.

V.3 An abbreviated form of one of the narrative clichés noted above IV n. 2.

V.4 *sa kare kapolaṃ dattvā cintāparo vyavasthitaḥ*. Another narrative cliché of very common occurrence and of considerable importance for 'reading' Buddhist art. How common it is can be gauged by the fact that it occurs more than a dozen times in the texts translated in von Schiefner's *Tibetan Tales* (pp. 21, 26, 50, 60, 80, 84, 86, 110, 125, etc), and this is only a small fraction of the occurrences I have noted — for some further occurrences in Sanskrit and Tibetan see *Saṅghabhedavastu* i 184; ii 39, 50, 124, 175, 187, 256; *Adhikaraṇavastu* 69; *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, GMs iii 1, 27, 85, 99, 104, 130, 141; *Cīvaravastu*, GMs iii 2, 10, 15, 17, 53, 70, 103; *Vibhaṅga*, Derge Ca 82b.5, 153a.6, 245b.4, 248b.7; *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga*, Derge Ta 27b.4, 31b.4, 32a.6. For some particularly good examples of the posture in Indian Buddhist art see A. Cunningham, *The Stūpa of Bharhut* (London: 1879) pl. xlvii; J.M. Rosenfield, *The Dynastic Arts of the Kushans* (Berkeley & Los Angeles: 1967) pl. 81, 82, 90, 100; B.K. Behl, *The Ajanta Caves. Artistic Wonder of Ancient Buddhist India* (New York: 1998) pp. 47, 51, 152. In the texts the posture is invariably associated with dejection, disconsolateness, despair, anxiety, grief and depression. When the contexts are clear the same holds for the art. Indeed, the posture is prescribed for "sitting in sorrow" in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* (T. Mehta, *Sanskrit Play Production in Ancient India* (Delhi: 1995) 138, 140). All of this makes the

identification of princely figures sitting in this posture as "celestial" Bodhisattvas very problematic, unless we allow that such bodhisattvas spent a lot of time seriously depressed.

V.5*svasti svasti.* This is in our texts the standard greeting delivered by a brahmin, and the narrative response always shows — as here — that those he so addressed assumed he wanted something (see *Cīvaravastu*, GMs iii 2, 57.3; *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge Tha 226a.6; etc). This was probably intended as a little brahmin joke. In the Tibetan translation of our text there is what corresponds to only a single *svasti*, but this is very likely by mistake.

V.6*kulaśulka* = *gnyod. Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo* gives for *gnyod: (rnying) rin thang dang / bud med kyi rin /*; cf. *BHSD* s.v. which cites only *Mahāvyutpatti*.

V.7The Tibetan 'adds' at the head of the list *gangs can gyi ri'i glang po che brgya*. In the verses below *gangs can ri yi glang chen brgya* translates *śataṃ haimavatā nāgāḥ*, but there is placed after the horses, *niṣkas* and mule carts are mentioned, and right before the *kāmbojika* girls. Given these later verses and the Tibetan it would seem reasonable to assume that *śatam haimavatānāṃ nāgānaṃ* has probably dropped out of the ms. But since this would create narrative difficulties in light of Biṃbisāra's request that Anāthapiṇḍada bring back to Śrāvastī a hundred such elephants which Prasenajit had given to him, and the verses may justly be referring to them, the presence of the elephants at the head of the list in the Tibetan could also have resulted from a hyper-correction by the editor of the Sanskrit text the Tibetans used who had overlooked this. In any case, the complexities do not allow an easy emendation.

V.8*niṣka* = *gser gyi rgyan.* A *niṣka* was both a golden ornament and the name of a coin. The Tibetan has chosen the first, and given that the last of the verses already referred to describes the *kāmbojika* girls as having "golden *niṣka* on their necks" this is a natural choice, were it not for the fact that coins were also commonly worn as jewelry in early India.

V.9Both Gnoli and Dutt have omitted the words *pratilekho dattaḥ* here, apparently by oversight. They are very clear in the ms. (fol. 948.1) and are translated in the Tibetan: *ye gi lan spring ngo* (for another instance where a letter is sent *(lekho 'nupreṣitaḥ)* to someone who then sends a return letter *(pratilekho visarjitaḥ)* see *Cīvaravastu*, GMs iii 2, 11.8 — here too the Tibetan translates *pratilekha as yi ge lan*, Tog Ga 62A.7). **Read:** *tenāpi vācayitvā pratilekho dattaḥ*.

V.10Both Gnoli and Dutt read *mānavakaḥ śālāṃ*, apparently taking *mānavakaḥ* with what in the present translation is the previous sentence. But the ms. (fol. 948.2) clearly has *māṇavakaśālām* — there is no case ending on *māṇavaka* — and the two words are almost certainly intended as a genitive *tatpuruṣa*. The Tibetan has taken it as such: *bram ze'i khye'u zhig gi khyim*. Note too, incidentally, that both Gnoli and Dutt have printed *mānavo, mānavena*, and *mānavaka* — where the ms. has correctly *māṇavo, māṇavena*, and *māṇavaka-*. **Read:** *māṇavakaśālām.*

V.11*viṣūcitaḥ*. Whatever the precise nature of *viṣūcita* it seems to have resulted from overeating rich foods and to have been fatal; see *Cīvaravastu*, GMs iii 2, 118.10 and 144.13 where two different

monks die of it after overeating (note too that just below *viṣūcita* is replaced with *pravāhika*). Jain narrative literature uses much the same expression in a story that satirizes the proclivity — apparently widely known — of Buddhist monks toward fine food and gluttony; see P. Granoff, "Divine Delicacies: Monks, Images, and Miracles in the Contest between Jainism and Buddhism," in *Images, Miracles, and Authority in Asian Religious Traditions*, ed. R.H. Davis (Boulder: 1998) 60; also 56, 66, 69, 70, 72 and 90 for the Buddhist monk's penchant for fine foods.

V.12 Dutt reads *aparicito brāhmaṇaḥ*, but the ms. clearly has plurals — *aparicitā brāhmaṇāḥ* (fol. 948.2)— and so does the Tibetan: *bram ze rnams dang ngo shes pa ma yin pas*. For the construction here see *BHSG* § 7.13, and for the meaning of *aparicita* note that Madhuskandha, although a brahmin, was a stranger or "foreigner" in Rājagṛha.

V.13 *aśucibhayād* = *mi gtsang bas skrag pas*.

V.14 Note that below in XXXI (43.3 ff) a senior monk throws a sick junior monk out of the cell that had been newly assigned to the senior — a form of the same verb, *niṣ√kas*, is used in both passages — but here "brahmins and householders," in criticizing the senior monk's actions, deny that they do such things, they deny that they do precisely what brahmins at least are described as doing in our present passage. The message is mixed, although the emphasis on the brahmanical fear of impurity in our passage is clear enough, and this emphasis is probably another attempt to tweak brahmanical values. For some further brief remarks on this passage see G. Schopen, "The Good Monk and His Money in a Buddhist Monasticism of 'The Mahāyāna Period," *The Eastern Buddhist*, n.s. 32.1 (2000) 94ff.

V.15 *daivād* = *stes te*. Needless to say this is not a common explanation of events in Buddhist narrative literature, although it does occur elsewhere in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. At, for example, both *Cīvaravastu*, GMs iii 2, 121.11, and *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, Derge Ka 299a.5 and 299b.2 (=*Divyāvadāna* 29.8 and 29.15), narrative actions are said to occur *daivayogād*, "according to fate."

V.16 At *Cīvaravastu*, GMs iii 2, 129, the Buddha himself is described as doing very much the same thing for a sick monk who he finds lying in his own urine and excrement, and virtually the same language is used: *vaṃśavidalikayā nirlikhitaḥ / pāṇḍumṛttikayā udvartitaḥ snāpitaḥ* ; and in the *Vibhaṅga*, in a text available only in its Tibetan translation, Queen Mālikā is said to have "had the dirt removed from the [dead body of] the Venerable Udāyin with white earth" (*sa dkar gyis dril phye byed du bcug nas* .. Derge Nya 65b.7). As is usually the case with everyday things, the precise nature of both a *viṃśavidalikā* and *pāṇḍumṛttika* is not actually known. For the former *BHSD* (s.v. *vidalikā*), citing only our passage and the *Cīvara* passage, gives "splinter (of bamboo)." Context suggests that it might have been a kind of soft brush probably made by splintering and splaying one end of a piece of bamboo. *pāṇḍumṛttika* seems to mean "yellowish white, white, pale" earth or clay, and is said to be "chalk," which it might well be. But in discussing the account of the death of the Monk Kālodayin I have been hesitant about the Sanskrit equivalent of Tibetan *sa dkar* (G. Schopen, "Ritual Rights and Bones of Contention," esp. 38) and should have referred to the present passage and *Cīvaravastu*, GMs iii 2, 129, since in both *sa dkar po* translates *pāṇḍumṛttika*. In fact the

translation of the phrase *paṇḍumṛttikayā udvartitaḥ* in the *Cīvara* is *sa dkar pos dril phye byas te*, and this is almost the same as what is found in the *Vibhaṅga*.

V.17Given the context this almost certainly refers to recitation of the Dharma as a 'healing' or deathbed ritual. Recitations of this sort were considered important enough that our *Vinaya requires* its monks to break their rain retreat if asked to perform them; see *Varṣāvastu*, GMs iii 4, 140.17 and G. Schopen, "The Ritual Obligations and Donor Roles of Monks in the Pāli Vinaya" *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 16 (1992) 87-107 [=*BSBM* 72-85].

V.18*cittam abhiprasādya = sems dang bskyed nas.* It is perhaps ironic — at least unexpected — that the cluster of expressions that is probably the most difficult to translate in a *Vinaya* text like ours has nothing to do with monastic realia or institutional procedure or technicalities of any sort, but rather with an inner experience, a 'feeling' or emotional reaction, which is very frequently referred to in our texts, and is presented as the personal response of an individual to persons, actions, and objects which affect him. The cluster includes the expression found here — *cittam abhiprasādya* — but also *prasādajāta, abhiprasanna, prasannaḥ prasannādhikāraṃ karoti*, etc. Just how common such expressions are, and the sort of difficulty they have presented to translators, both ancient and modern, can be seen at a glance in Feer's translation of the *Avadānaśataka*, a text which appears in part to be dependent on our *Vinaya* (see Schopen, "Dead Monks and Bad Debts," ns. 20 & 21 and the sources cited there), and is overwhelmingly addressed to monks (II n.35 above). Feer's translation is not heavily annotated and it is therefore all the more remarkable that more than fifty of his notes deal with the words *prasāda, cittam prasādayamasa, prasannacitta*, etc., and their treatment in the Tibetan translation of his text. *prasāda*, for example, is often translated into Tibetan in two different ways, often on the same page, and Feer himself then translates it in yet a third way. On p. 69, for example, he translates *prasāda* as "une grande faveur," but adds in a note: "Ou 'joie.' *Prasāda*, tib. *dga;*" on p. 122 he translates *cittam prasādya* as "il mourut avec des sentiments joyeux," noting that the Tibetan renders it *sems dga ba bskyed nas*, but is compelled to add: "Cependant cette expression désigne plutôt le calme de l'esprit, le silence des passions;" on p. 359 he translates *prasāda* first as "sentiments pieux," but notes that the Tibetan has *"dad'* 'foi,'" then by "bonnes dispositions," while noting that the Tibetan renders it "par *dga* 'joie,'" and finally again by "bonnes dispositions," but citing the Tibetan as *"dad* 'foi'" — all of this on a single page; on p. 46 *prasāda* is rendered "joie," "joie intime" and twice by "foi;" elsewhere he uses "dispositions joyeuses" (66), "dispositions . . . favorables" (74), "profonde joie," (159), etc. All of this should by no means be taken to indicate confusion on Feer's part; nor it seems were the Tibetan translators confused when they shifted back and forth between *dga' ba* and *dad pa;* they were rather struggling to get a difficult expression right, and to mark the fact that a single term like this can mean many things — joy, faith, favorable disposition, gratitude, pious feeling, and more. Since many of the Sanskrit expressions will appear repeatedly in our text, and since they are more than usually context-sensitive, it will be more convenient to formulate any generalizations about them not here, but after their occurrences have been seen. For the moment note that in the *Śayanāsanavastu* — as almost everywhere else — these expressions occur overwhelmingly in two contexts, and the occurrence of the experience they refer to virtually always has predictable results. One of these contexts is the one we find in the present passage: the experience occurs at or near the moment of death and — as here — results in a favorable

rebirth. In the second, the experience results from the encounter of an individual with a Buddhist person, action or object and results in that individual making a generous donation. One example from the *Avadānaśataka* nicely illustrates the pattern: "La vue du Buddha fit naître chez les brahmanes maîtres de maison, une grande joie [*mahāprasāda*], et par suite de la joie qui s'était produite en eux, ils fournirent abondamment Bhagavat et la confrérie de ses auditeurs, de vêtements, de boulettes de riz, de lits, de sièges" (Feer, 65).

V.19*bhavana* = *gnas*.

V.20Dutt reads *śivikadvāraṃ*, and *BHSD* s.v. follows him. But Gnoli, with the ms. (fol. 948.4) here (but cf. below), *śivikādvāraṃ*. Tibetan has *lho sgo*, "the south gate." Misled by Dutt, *BHSD* had trouble explaining the term, but it is almost certainly to be taken as "the gate for [funereal] palanquins/biers" (note that both *śivikā* and *śibikā* occur as variant spellings of the same word). Funereal biers were apparently always taken out of the southern gate, hence the Tibetan, or the Sanskrit it depends on. (Note that in the Pāli *Vinaya* the *yakkha* who plays the role Madhuskandha has in our text is named Sīvaka (Pāli *Vinaya* ii 156.2), but this may be only one of several details that seem to suggest that the Pāli version is a badly bowdlerized one. Note too that *Arthaśāstra* (Kangle) 2.36.31 uses the term *śavadvāra* to refer to what must be the same gate.)

V.21Both Gnoli and Dutt read *preṣaya iti*, and the Tibetan has *len pa thong zhig ces*. In spite of this I still think that the ms. (fol. 948.5) cannot have had this. It appears to read *nāyayeti* (i.e. *nāyaya + iti*) — a comparison of these four *akṣaras* with *anupreṣitam* which occurs only six *akṣaras* before them in the same line would seem to completely rule out reading *preṣaya iti;* see also *āneyaṃ* and *āneṣyasi* (Gnoli misprints *aneṣyasi*) a few lines below. **Read:** *nāyayeti*.

V.22Gnoli reads by emendation "Ex conject., from Tib.": *tatra prayojanaṃ [na]bhavati*. He used the Lhasa edition of the Tibetan and it presumably reads — as does Derge — *der bdag la 'tshal ba ma mchis na*. But Tog here may be correct and reads: *der bdag 'tshal ba mchis na*, so for the moment **Read:** with *[na]* deleted, although the construction remains odd.

VI

VI.1Although Gnoli's notations differ somewhat from place to place, in his edition of the *Śayanāsana* he says that the text in the *Saṅghabhedavastu* that "repeats" verbatim this and the following sections (up through XIII) of the *Śayanāsana* starts here. The verbatim 'repetition' of *Śayanāsana* VI through XIII in the *Saṅghabheda* begins: "Again, on that occasion the Blessed One was staying in Rājagṛha, in the Bamboo Forest, in the Haunt of the Kalandakas. There was a householder in Rājagṛha. He had invited the Blessed One, together with the Community of Monks, to his house. And on that occasion the householder Anāthapiṇḍada had arrived at Rājagṛha just on account of some business (*kenacid eva karaṇīyena*). He spent the night in the residence of that householder..." etc, with the text of the *Śayanāsana* following. In other words the *Saṅghabheda* omits the account of Anāthapiṇḍada seeking a bride for his seventh son, the story of Madhuskandha's negotiating the bride-price, his

death and divine rebirth, and the account of Prasenajit asking Anāthapiṇḍada to bring back the elephants. But since all of these things are then alluded to later in the *Saṅghabheda*, where on their own they would make no sense, this would seem to be clear indication of the dependency of the *Saṅghabheda* on the *Śayanāsana*, and would seem to make it certain that the redactors of the former simply repeated the text of the latter without adjusting it or removing the anomalies. — The repetition of the account of the founding of the Jetavana would seem to point once again to its importance.

VI.2 Dutt reads *ullāṭṭayata*, and *BHSD* s.v. *ullāḍayati* cites this. But the ms. (fol. 948.7) almost certainly has *ullāḍayataḥ*, as Gnoli reads, but without *visarga*.

VI.3 *maṇḍalavāṭam* (and this is the spelling in the ms. - fol. 948.8) = *bkad sa*. Jäschke defines the latter as either "a bake-house, kitchen, cook's shop" or an "open hall or shed, erected on festive occasions;" *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo* gives "(1)*zas g-yos sbyor byed sa'i khang pa 'am / zas za sa'i khang pa* / (2) *'dug gral dang 'tshog sa ste 'dzoms sa.* The meaning "courtyard" given by *BHSD* s.v. *maṇḍala-māḍa* is entirely dependent on the Tibetan —*'khor gyi (') khyams* — which it cites from the *Mahāvyutpatti*, where this is in fact given as the equivalent of *maṇḍalamāḍa* (5518). *BHSD* also describes the considerable variation in the 'spelling' (?) of the Sanskrit term.

VI.4 Gnoli has *agārād* in both the *Śayanāsana* and *Saṅghabheda*, but the ms. (fol. 949.1) for the former has correctly and so **Read:** *āgārād*.

VI.5 Gnoli in both *Śayanāsana* and *Saṅghabheda* is rather garbled here. The ms. (fol. 949.2) reads: *saṃti gṛhapate kṣatriyakulād api kulaputrāḥ keśaśmasrv avatārya kāṣāyāṇi vastrāṇy ācchādya samyaxxxddhayā tam eva bhagavantaṃ pravrajitam anupravrajitā [/] brāhmaṇakulād api vaiśyakulād api śūdrakulād api kulaputrāḥ keśaśmaśrv avatārya kāṣāyāṇi vastrāṇy ācchādya samyag eva śraddhayā āgārād anagārikaṃ tam eva pravrajitam anupravrajitāḥ.* Dutt is much closer to the ms., though he twice reads *-śmaśrūṇy* for what I would read with hesitation *-śmaśrv* (the facsimile is difficult to read). Gnoli has tried to normalize and regularize the repetitions (and in the process introduced such anomalies as *anāgārād)* apparently being led by the Tibetan. **Read:** with ms.

VI.6 Gnoli inserts *[śvaḥ]*. It is in the Tibetan — *sang* — and apparently in the ms. for the *Saṅghabheda*, where it appears in Gnoli's edition without brackets. So **Read.**

VI.7 The Śītavana was not, of course, literally in Rājagṛha, but, as our own narrative makes clear, outside the city walls. It is well known in our *Vinaya*. In the *Vibhaṅga* (Derge Ca 123a.6), for example, a monk who chooses to do meditation rather than recitation, goes to the Śītavana; at *Cīvaravastu*, GMs iii 2, 42.20, the physician Jīvaka goes there to get "flesh" that he needs to cure a patient, and it is explicitly described as having corpses *(aśūnyaṃ ca śītavanaṃ śmaśānaṃ mṛtakuṇapena)*. This last raises the issue of the nature of *śmaśāna*. In spite of the fact that *Saṅghabhedavastu* ii 92.23, for example, explicitly defines *śmaśāna* as "where one who is dead is cremated" *(śmaśāneti yatra mṛto dahyate)*, a large number of passages elsewhere in the same *Vinaya* indicate that uncremated corpses were left there (for a particularly good example see *Kṣudrakavastu*,

Derge Tha 222b.2-224b.1, which contains instructions on how monks should strip corpses), and this corresponds to what is found in Indian literature as a whole: "In most literary references the *śmaśāna*, or cremation ground, is described as covered with putrefying corpses and haunted by dogs and vultures, rather than as the scene of cremation. The descriptions of such places show that many people in ancient India did not cremate their dead, but . . . merely abandoned their bodies to the wild beasts. No doubt economic considerations played a big part in this practice." (A.L. Basham, *The Wonder That Was India*, 3rd ed. (New York: 1968) 178 — for a particularly graphic description of a *śmaśāna* translated from the Tamil, see P. Richman, *Women, Branch Stories, and Religious Rhetoric in a Tamil Buddhist Text* (Syracuse: 1988) 54 ff). For Sītavana in Pāli sources see G.P Malalasekera, *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names* (London: 1938) Vol. II, 1154-55.

VI.8 Like Brahmadatta (see above II n.21), Anāthapiṇḍada's immediate reaction to hearing about a religiously powerful person is the desire to "see" him: *labhyam . . . so 'smābhir bhagavān draṣṭum.*

VI.9 *buddhālambanayā smṛtyā = sangs rgyas la dmigs pa'i dran pas.*

VI.10 Here, and almost always below spelled *śivika-*, but Gnoli in *Saṅghabheda* always gives *śivikā-*.

VI.11 There is an *akṣara* after *rātryā* and before *dvau* in the ms. (fol. 949.5) that looks very much like *-pra-*, although there may be the trace of a vowel marker above it. The sense does not seem to require it, nor the Tibetan to reflect it. Since I cannot explain it it would have been more convenient, of course, to ignore it, which is what both Dutt and Gnoli did.

VI.12 *BHSD*, s.v. *śivika-dvāra*, seems to take *pūrvakaṃ* and *pāścimakam* as qualifications of the gate, and the grammar of the Sanskrit might well suggest this. It says of the construction: "implying a double gate, both parts open." But sense, it seems, requires it, and the Tibetan *(mtshan mo'i thun dang po dang tha ma gñis la)* makes it virtually certain that both *pūrvaka* and *paścimaka* refer here to the first and last watches of the night.

VI.13 The appearance, and subsequent disappearance, of this light is not explained.

VI.14 A culturally natural assumption since city gates were normally closed during the night (see, for example, J. Auboyer, *La vie quotidienne dans l'inde ancienne* (Paris: 1961) 157). *Arthaśāstra* (Kangle) 2.36.34-.38 in fact suggests that, in theory at least, movement at night even within the city was severely restricted — Scharfe actually uses the word "curfew;" H. Scharfe, *The State in Indian Tradition* (Leiden: 1989) 172; but cf. XIV n. 16 below.

VI.15 *sthaṇḍila = 'dug gnas.* Presumably the space for offerings for the divine resident of the gate.

VI.16 Gnoli prints *anyadevatānamaskāraṃ kariṣyati* in the *Śayanāsana* and *anyadevatā namaskāraṃ kariṣyati* in the *Saṅghabheda.* But the ms. (fol. 949.8) and Dutt read *-ānyadevatā namaskariṣyati.* **Read**: with ms. Note too that this statement is, presumably, inflected with some alarm on the *devaputra*'s part. The implications of *anyadevatā* here seem to be much like those of

ananyadeva, cited by *BHSD* s.v. from the *Lalitavistara* as an epithet of the Buddha, and interpreted there — almost certainly correctly — as "having no other god (beside him), i.e. sole god;" or like those of *ananyadevatā,* "having no other god," a characterization of those who become Buddhist lay brothers or sisters (*upāsaka, upāsikā* — see N. Dutt, *Gilgit Manuscripts* (Srinagar: 1939) Vol. I 19.7 [This is the *Bhaiṣajyaguru-sūtra*]; P.M. Harrison, *The Tibetan Text of the Pratyutpanna-buddha-saṃmukhāvasthita-samādhi-sūtra* (Tokyo: 1978) 11B.14; 12B.8; 12C.8). All these expressions would seem — at least by implication or innuendo — to place the Buddha into the category of *deva.*

VI.17This verse is missing from the ms. (fol. 949.9) but found apparently in Gnoli's ms. of the *Saṅghabheda* (he gives no indication in his edition of either the *Śayanāsana* or the *Saṅghabheda* of this omission in our ms.). It is also found in the Tibetan, and there are other indications that it was the first of the set of three (see below n. 21). Given the repetition of exactly the same prose exhortation before each verse it is easy to see how a typical scribal eye-skip could have occurred. Dutt's n.2, p. 140, is misplaced and misleading in regard to the end of the ms.; see n. 22 below.

VI.18*padāvihārasyaikasya* = *gom pa gcig gcig bor ba yi.* For *padāvihāra* or *padā vihāra* see *BHSD* s.v. *vihāra* (3). The expression is not common and the occurrences here should be added to those in *BHSD* which, in effect, all come from a single text (*Divyāvadāna* 74.17-80.10 = *Divyāvadāna* 465.10-469.19 = *Bhaiṣajyavastu,* GMs iii 1, 73.16-78.14; and cf. *pa[da](ṃ) [vi]hāre samatikramaṃtti* in a fragment from Kucha — H. Lüders, *Philologica Indica* (Göttingen: 1940) 612). In the *Bhaiṣajyavastu/Divyāvadāna* text(s) the expression is clearly interchangeable with *pradakṣiṇīkṛta: anyatamena copāsakena sa pradeśaḥ pradakṣiṇīkṛtaḥ / evaṃ ca cetasā cittam abhisaṃskṛtam / asmān me padāvihārāt kiyat puṇyaṃ bhaviṣyatīti /.* But such an equation does not work well in our text since Anāthapiṇḍada has already done *pradakṣiṇa* at the "residential ground" of Madhuskandha at the city gate, and *pradakṣiṇa* is about the only thing he does *not* do when he actually meets the Buddha. A good guess here in regard to *padā (-) vihāra* is that it is an old — perhaps almost obsolete — expression for what we might call pilgrimage, a religious journey or visit undertaken by foot. (The corresponding expression in the Pāli version of the account (Pāli *Vinaya* ii 156.5) is *padavītihāra.*)

VI.19Dutt reads *eṣā dattā,* but Gnoli, correctly, *īṣādantā* (see fol. 949.9); Tibetan: *gshol mda'i mche bar ldan.*

VI.20Dutt reads *mahāgajāḥ,* but Gnoli, correctly, *mahaṅgajāḥ* (see fol. 949.9); Tibetan *ma tang gar skyes.*

VI.21These verses — certainly the first one — had a life beyond our text. The first verse, for example, also occurs towards the end of the Tibetan version of the *Caityapradakṣiṇagāthā* (Derge Mdo Sa 200b.3), but not, apparently, in the version found among the Gilgit manuscripts. More interesting perhaps, and as has been pointed out elsewhere (Schopen, "Marking Time in Buddhist Monasteries," 166 and n. 14), Vinītadeva, in his commentary on the *Vibhaṅga* called the *Vinayavibhaṅgapadavyākhyāna,* identifies these verses (he actually cites the first two lines of the first verse, and then adds "etc") as the verses used in the worship of a monastery's *stūpa.* — In the Pāli

version (this part of which also occurs at *Saṃyutta* i 210-12) similar verses occur, but in spite of the fact that the verses refer to a hundred elephants, horses, carts with she-mules, and "a hundred thousand maidens," none of these things have been referred to before in the Pāli version, so the verses themselves lack context and make little natural sense, pointing again, perhaps, to the bowdlerized character of this version (see also V. 20 n.2 above). Interestingly enough, the corresponding verse in the Pāli version of the same incident (Pāli *Vinaya* ii 156.3) is also the verse that a novice is to reflect on in worshipping the monastery's *stupa* according to the Sinhala monastic handbook entitled *Dinacariyāva* (see R.S. Hardy, *Eastern Monachism* (London: 1850, repr. Delhi: 1989)27).

VI.22The continuous folios reproduced in the facsimile edition of the *Śayanāsana* end here. There are two additional fragmentary folios, now carefully edited in Wille, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Vinayavastu der Mūlasarvāstivādin*, 115-21, one of which appears to have immediately followed the last complete folio.

VI.23*cittam abhiprasādya* — see V n. 18 above.

VI.24*nāvara* = *mchog ma yin pa ma yin zhing.*

VI.25*yatredānīṃ devatā api autsukyam āpadyante tasya bhagavato darśanāya.* Note the role of *darśan* here, but note as well that Buddhist, Jain, and Hindu narrative literature are full of instances in which — as here — a deceased individual who has been reborn as a *devatā,* or "demi-god," returns or appears to a former acquaintance or his or her old community to point them religiously in the right direction; see Granoff, "Divine Delicacies," esp. 94 n. 35.

VI.26In referring to the excerpt of it in the *Saṃyutta*, Mrs. Rhys Davids has already noted the weird character of this account: "There is an eerie atmosphere about the simple story that is Bunyanic" (Mrs. Rhys Davids, *The Book of the Kindred Sayings* (London: 1917) 271 n. 2). But it is weird in several senses of the term, and the role of Madhuskanda in particular can probably not be fully appreciated unless one realizes how preposterous it almost certainly would have seemed to an Indian audience that a rich and respectable businessman would have gone — in the middle of the night — to a charnel grounds to see some otherwise shiftless *sadhu*: to be believable such action would have required — as it duly receives here — divine intervention!

VI.27*bahir vihārasyābhyavakāse bhagavān caṅkrameṇa caṅkramyate* — but **Read**, with *Saṅghabheda* and Wille:...*caṃkrame caṃkramyate.* This would seem to suggest that there was a *vihāra* — whatever its precise nature — in the charnel grounds, and other texts indicate that a *vihāra* could at least be close enough to such places so that the smell of dead bodies could disturb a delicate monk's concentration (see *Bhaiṣajyavastu,* GMs iii 1, 223.7-224.12, where the Buddha as a consequence allows *vihāras* to be adorned with perfumes, garlands, incense and aromatic powders). But, although the expression we find here in the *Śayanāsana* is also something of a cliché, and although it occurs at least once in a context where narratively there should not have even been a *vihāra* (i.e. at Kuśinagara just before the Buddha's death; *Avadānaśataka* (Speyer) i 228.9), here there

can be no doubt: immediately below the Buddha takes Anāthapiṇḍada into the *vihāra*. It is, of course, narratively very unusual to have a *vihāra* at such a site and monks are more routinely described as *going out* to a charnel grounds and returning to the *vihāra* (see Schopen, "Deaths, Funerals and the Division of Property in a Monastic Code," 487, 488, 494, 496, 501).

VI.28*pratisaṃmodanayā pratisammodate* = *yang dag par dgyes par 'gyur bas / yang dag par dgyes par byed de*. It is hard to know how precisely to nuance this phrase, but such a greeting was clearly to be seen as out of character with the "proper" approach of a layman to the Buddha — notice that it is not even included in the exchange allowed between monks in I above — and might even have invoked laughter on the part of its monastic audience. This guy — Anāthapiṇḍada — clearly did not know what was going on, and, given Anāthapiṇḍada's otherwise later exemplary behavior, the Chinese translators of the version found in *The Sūtra of the Wise and the Foolish* (or their Khotanese brethren who recited it) apparently felt this required an explanation. They twice say he "did not [yet] know the rules for ceremonial obeisance and offerings," and then they have "Suddhāvāsa Deva" transform himself into four people who show him what should be done. Indeed, if Mair's translation is anywhere near correct, Anāthapiṇḍada's greeting is far more outrageous in Chinese than in Sanskrit. Mair has: "Not knowing the ceremonial rules, he straight-forwardly asked the World Honored, 'Hi, Gautama! How are you?,'" adding in a note to "Hi:" "Pu-shen is a highly colloquial greeting" (Mair, *The Linguistic and Textual Antecedents of the Sūtra of the Wise and Foolish,* 41 and n. 63; but cf. Brown, "From Sūtra to Pien-Wen: A Study of 'Sudatta Erects a Monastery' and the Hsiang-mo Pien-wen," 91, where the translation is much tamer). Much of the awkwardness appears to have been edited out of the Pāli version, where Anāthapiṇḍada at least "inclined his head to the Lord's feet," and in Horner's translation it is weakened even further.

VI.29Gnoli reads *āśaktin*, Dutt *āsaktim*, but Wille (supported by *Udānavarga* XXX.29) *āśāstim*. **Read**: with Wille.

VI.30For the very limited parallels or partial parallels for these verses see *Udānavarga* XXX.28-.29 and notes.

VI.31It is only at this point — and even then it is somewhat awkwardly placed — that Anāthapiṇḍada behaves "properly" (i.e. as everybody else in approaching the Buddha). This is after the Buddha's response to the pleasantry, which, presumably, made it clear to Anāthapiṇḍada what he was dealing with.

VI.32Everyone has 'seen' a different grammar here. Dutt (and this is not supposed to be a reconstruction): *kāmānām āsvādādīnavasaṃkleśavyavadānaṃ naiṣkramyapravivekānuśaṃsaṃ vyavadānapakṣyān dharmān vistareṇa saṃprakāśayati /*; Gnoli: *kāmānām āsvādādīnavasaṅkleśavyavadānanaiṣkramyapraviveka [*in *Saṅghabheda: — praviveke] anuśaṃsavyavadānapakṣyān dharmān*, etc; Wille: *kāmānām āsvādādīnavasaṃkleśavyavadānanaiṣkramyapravivekānuśaṃsavyavadānapakṣyān dharmān*, etc; even the normally helpful Tibetan offers no aid or comfort: *'dod pa rnams kyi mnog dang / nyes dmigs dang / kun nas nyon mongs pa dang / rnam par byang ba dang / nges par 'byung ba dang / rab tu dben pa'i phan yon gyi phyogs dang mthun pa'i chos . . . ,* although

it — like Wille — appears to take most of the text as one long *dvandva* compound. The Sanskrit appears to be corrupt and the translation here merely provisional — I do think, however, that the second *-vyavadāna* - should be deleted, as in the Tibetan for the *Śayanāsana* (but cf. Wille 116 n.13), and have translated accordingly.

VI.33 *abhisameti* = *mngon par rtogs te.*

VI.34 Gnoli: *pratigṛhṇāti;* but with Dutt and Wille. **Read:** *pratigṛhṇīyād.*

VI.35 *dharmeṣu.*

VI.36 *abhikrānto 'haṃ bhadantābhikrāntaḥ.* Notice how this echoes Madhuskandha's repeated exhortation above: *abhikrāma gṛhapate...*

VI.37 *upāsaka.* As has been pointed out elsewhere this is a term and a category which requires much fuller study, both in inscriptions (Schopen, "Ritual Obligations and Donor Roles of Monks in the Pāli *Vinaya*," 103-4 & n.1 [= *BSBM*, 80 & n. 24]) and texts (Schopen, "Ritual Rights and Bones of Contention," 42-43 and n. 30). It is becoming clearer that although *upāsaka* and *upāsikā* have habitually been translated as "layman" and "laywoman" they appear rather to have been "a small group that fell somewhere between monks and nuns and the general population" that "had a particularly close and formally acknowledged relationship with their monastic communities" (ib. n. 30 — see also P. Harrison, "Searching for the Origins of the Mahāyāna: What are We Looking For?," *The Eastern Buddhist*, n.s. 28 (1995) 67). The comparative rarity of the term *upāsaka* in donative inscriptions, for example, is mirrored by its infrequency in our text. Our text refers repeatedly to donors and devout laymen, but — although other titles are used — they are almost never called *upāsaka*. Note too that according to the formula found here, and frequently elsewhere, one became an *upāsaka* for life—"for as long as I live and have breath."

VI.38 Gnoli reads *śaraṇāgatam*, but Dutt and Wille *śaraṇagatam*. **Read** with the latter.

VI.39 *abhiprasanna* = *mngon par dad.*

VII

VII.1 Śrāvastī, normally called a *nagara* or *mahānagara*, is here called a *nigama*. This is very likely what the Tibetan translators had also read: *grong rdal.*

VII.2 Gnoli reads: *cīvarapiṇḍapātaglānapratyayabhaiṣajya-;* but Dutt and Wille (and the Tibetan) have the expected *cīvarapiṇḍapātaśayanāsanaglānapratyayabhaiṣajya-* (Wille ms. actually has *-bhairajya-).* **Read** with Dutt and Wille.

VII.3 The use of the future passive participles here is almost certainly not casual or coincidental since — as we will see below (XIX, 35.1 ff) — Mūlasarvāstivādin monks were under strict obligation to "use" all *vihāras* that were made available.

VII.4 Gnoli reads in both the *Śayanāsana* and *Saṅghabheda: anuprayaccha me bhagavan bhikṣuṃ sahāyakam yena sahāyakena śrāvastyāṃ bhagavato 'rthāya vihāraṃ kārayāmīti (śrāvastyāṃ* is omitted in the *Saṅghabheda).* But this does not correspond with what remains of the fragmentary folio, nor with either Tibetan translation (see Wille 118 & n. 31). Wille suggests: *anuprayaccha me bhagavan ekaṃ bhikṣuṃ sahāyakaṃ / tena sārdham ahaṃ śrāvastyām*, etc. So **Read.**

Such monk "assistants" are not uncommonly met with in our *Vinaya,* almost always in association with constructional or building projects. They are referred to as *sahāyakas,* as here and in the account of the founding of the *Ghoṣilārama* that is given in the *Vibhaṅga* (Derge Nya 140b.4), or as *dharmasahāyas* in the *Varṣāvastu* (GMs iii 4, 139.9,.15 — in connection with establishing *stūpas* or adding accoutrements to them; for an inscriptional record of a monk acting in just such a capacity see Schopen, "The Ritual Obligations and Donor Roles of Monks in the Pāli *Vinaya,*" 95ff [=*BSBM* 76ff]) and in the *Kṣudrakavastu* (Derge Tha 192a.6, again in connection with founding a *vihāra*) or, finally, as *puṇyasahāyas* as in both the *Vibhaṅga* (Derge CA 146a.5) and the *Uttaragrantha* (Derge Pa 123b.3; the first in association with the construction of a "steam bath house;" the second with yet another *vihāra*). These references typically occur — though not always — in a set narrative frame, the *Kṣudrakavastu* passage just referred to being a good example:

> "A certain householder lived in Śrāvastī and from time to time a mendicant monk came to his house. The mendicant monk established him in the refuges and the foundations of training. On one occasion he recited to him the praises of the seven things which make the merit that arises from material goods (*puṇyakriyāvastu* — see below XVI, 33.20), and the householder said : 'Noble One, I would do something which makes the merit that arises from material goods.'
>
> The mendicant monk said: 'That is good, householder, you should do so!'
> 'But, Noble One, what should I do?'
> 'Householder, you should make a *vihāra* for the community!'
> 'Noble One, I have the money (*kārṣāpaṇas*), but not one who acts as the religious assistant (*dharmasahāya*).'
> 'Householder, give the money! I am your religious assistant.'
> Saying 'Noble One, it is good — this is the money,' he gave it to him . . ."

Such passages go on to make it clear that a monk who is acting as a "religious assistant" not only receives the money for the project, but "hires, oversees and pays the laborers; buys the necessary tools; and is told, for example, to use the construction funds for his food" as well (Schopen, "The Good Monk and His Money," 100).

VII.5 Gnoli prints *vidheyaḥ*, but signals in the *Saṅghabheda* (171n.1) that this is an emendation and that the ms. has *vineya;* Wille has *[v]i(neyaḥ)* and the Tibetan for both has *'dul bar 'gyur.* **Read**: *vineyaḥ*.

VII.6 Narratively this appears to be the beginning of a close association between Anāthapiṇḍada and Śāriputra. In the account of the disposition of Śāriputra's mortal (?) remains in the *Kṣudrakavastu* Anāthapiṇḍada claims a special relationship with Śāriputra, and this claim is sanctioned by the Buddha himself who grants him — initially — sole and private possession of Śāriputra's relics — see Schopen, "Ritual Rights and Bones of Contention," 44 ff.

VIII

VIII.1 *yathāparibhuktaṃ* = *ji ltar longs spyad pa.* More literally "as he had used them." Bedding and seats normally belonged to the *vihāra,* or "donor," not to the individual monk, and they must stay where they were 'given;' see *Vibhaṅga,* Derge Cha 205a.6; *Uttaragrantha,* Derge Pa 84a.7; 122b.5-123a.3; 123a.4-.7; Schopen, "The Lay Ownership of Monasteries," 109-10; and below VII n. 7, end.

VIII.2 Gnoli has *ekaikarātrinivāsena;* but Wille *ekaikarātridivasena* — the Tibetan here supports Gnoli, but not conclusively: *nub mo nub mo zhing;* still, **Read** with Wille.

VIII.3 Gnoli reads *sa praviśann eva śrāvastīm.* The reading is not preserved in Wille's fragment but the Tibetan for both *Śayanāsana* and *Saṅghabheda (de mnyam yod du ma zhugs pa nyid du),* and context (parks, groves, etc. would normally be expected to be outside the city), render Gnoli's reading suspicious. Bearing in mind that *avagraha* is not used in these manuscripts, the remedy is to assume the loss of the privative *a-* of an original *apraviśan* and an irregular sandhi of *saḥ*. This would bring the text into line with the Tibetan and with context. **Read** *sa 'praviśann.* Exactly the same thing seems to occur several lines further on; see n.6 below.

VIII.4 Wille's first fragmentary folio — no. 319 — ends here.

VIII.5 The description here is that of an ideal site for a monastery and is, of course, a cliché.

VIII.6 Gnoli reads *sa praviśann eva svaṃ niveśanaṃ,* but once again this does not fit with the Tibetan for either the *Śayanāsana* or the *Saṅghabheda (de rang gi khyim du ma song ba nyid du)* which require a negative. Since the construction here is exactly the same as that noted above (n. 3), the interpretation advanced there should presumably be applied here as well. **Read:** *sa 'praviśann.*

VIII.7 I assume there is some word-play going on here in what follows — in the Chinese version (see IV n.1 above) Jeta explicitly says he was "joking." *ārāma* does of course mean "park," but it also means "pleasure," and there are good reasons for suspecting that the wording here was intentionally vague, or even obscure. In fact there are good reasons to suspect that the wording here may have been intended to obscure an acute embarrassment: our author almost certainly knew, and knew his

audience would recognize, that this 'sale' of the Jetavana was almost certainly illegal. Jeta is repeatedly referred to as a *kumāra*, which can mean "prince," but first of all means "child" or "boy," (see the use of *kumāra* in the text cited at the end of V n. 1 above) and a child — according to *dharmaśāstra* — cannot legally dispose of any property. Moreover, Jeta was supposed to be the son of King Prasenajit, and narratively Prasenajit was still very much alive, so Jeta himself was dependent. Since a child remains dependent as long as his father is alive "no matter how old he is," and since "a transaction done by one who is not independent is invalid," any sale on Jeta's part would be illegal. Our author has already earlier given every indication that he was familiar with such ideas (see IV above), and since he had already dealt with the legal problems that Anāthapiṇḍada's actions as a child raised he could not have been unaware of the even more serious ones here. In the absence of a ready solution — and there appears to have been none — some obfuscation might well have been in order. But that our author appears to have remained nervous about the 'transaction' would seem to follow from the further fact that he will shortly have the case decided in Anāthapiṇḍada's favor through divine inspiration — never a good sign. Note, finally, that the translation here is merely intended to show that the exchange in the original almost certainly involved some sort of word-play or intentional vagueness — I am by no means sure I got it right, and there are almost certainly other, and probably better, ways of doing this.

[In spite of the previous "finally" there is one other point that might well bear on the troubling character of the 'sale' of the Jetavana, but it needs very much to be kept in brackets because it involves the vexed and much discussed question of whether or not the king owned the land — all of it — in early and classical India. The debate is an old one and as usual nicely summarized by Basham (*The Wonder That Was India*, 110-111 — if proof be needed that the discussion has not moved much beyond what it was in his day, see, for example, S. Dutta, *Land System in Northern India.* c. AD 400- c. AD 700 (New Delhi: 1995) 8ff). But even without attempting to fit it into the larger debate it is important to note that the redactors of our *Vinaya* appear to have been of the opinion that the King did, indeed, own the land. This view is, at least, explicitly expressed in several places, and anyone familiar with the passages in which it is expressed would almost certainly have been discomfitted with what he read in our text. One of the clearest of such passages occurs in the *Vibhaṅga* (Derge Ca 246.6ff), in a text which begins very much like that cited above at VII n. 4. But here when a brahmin is advised to have a *vihāra* constructed, he says to the monk who had advised him: "Noble One, although I have the money (*kārṣāpaṇas*), in regard to land, since the king is the owner, I do not have the ground to give on which to build a *vihāra* for the Community" (*'phags pa bdag la kār ṣā pa ṇa dag ni mchis na / 'on kyang sa gzhi ni rgyal po dbang bas gang du dge 'dun gyi gtsug lag khang bgyid du stsal ba'i dog sa ma mchis so /*). The monk tells him not to worry, that he will solicit land from the king (*...kho bos rgyal po las sa bslang bar bya'o /*), and as the text continues we find it said three different times that "the king owns the land (*gzhi rgyal po dbang pos...*, and *gzhi rgyal po mnga' bas...*, and *gzhi ni rgyal po dbang bas...*), and that "the lord (i.e. king) must necessarily bestow the land" (*lhas dog sa stsal bar rigs so /*). In a very different context, and in a general statement in regard to what we think of as 'monastic' property, we also find it said at least twice: "the king owns the land; the owner (of the *vihāra*) owns the seats and bedding; the monk owns the bowl and robe" (*rgyal po ni sa gzhi la dbang la / bdag po ni gnas mal la dbang / dge slong ni lhung bzed dang chos gos la dbang ngo /* ; *Vibhaṅga*, Derge Cha 205a.6; *rgyal po ni sa gzhi la dbang ngo / bdag po ni mal stan la dbang ngo / dge slong ni lhung bzed dang chos gos la dbang*

ngo / ; *Uttaragrantha*, Derge Pa 84a.7). Again, anyone familiar with passages like these would have had a problem getting around the 'fact' that Jeta was — from yet another angle — in no position to sell what did not belong to him.]

VIII.8In the Tibetan translation of the *Śayanāsana*, but not in that of the *Saṅghabheda*, *skyed mos tshal*, i.e. *udyāna*, appears here, not *kun dga' ra ba* = *ārāma*, indicating that the word-play, or at least the passage, gave those translators trouble too.

VIII.9*koṭisaṃstareṇāpi*, but Tibetan: *gser bye ba gshibs kyang*, suggesting perhaps that a word for 'gold' has dropped out of the manuscript.

VIII.10*kṛtārgho 'si kumāra ārāmasya* = *gzhon nus kun dga' ra ba'i rin bcad zin gyis* /. The Tibetan translators made no attempt here to translate the grammar of the Sanskrit.

VIII.11*hiraṇyasuvarṇa*. Tibetan takes as a *dvandva* — *gser dang dbyig* — but either or both of the Sanskrit terms can refer to a coin.

VIII.12*vyāvahārikapuruṣa* = *zhal che gcod pa'i sna chen po la gtogs pa'i mi*. This term is not a common one and the Tibetan is more gloss than translation.

VIII.13*lokapāla*.

VIII.14*ātmānam abhinirmāya* = *bdag nyid mngon par sprul nas*.

VIII.15*arthādhikaraṇa* = *dgos pa'i phyir 'dus so*.

VIII.16Silence in our *Vinaya* frequently signals assent, but not always. It can also indicate consternation, confusion or dismay (see G. Schopen, "Monastic Law Meets the Real World: A Monk's Continuing Right to Inherit Family Property in Classical India," *History of Religions* 35 (1995) 114-15). Here it is especially difficult to interpret since at least the reader, having been informed of the composition of the court, could hardly have been convinced of the fairnesss of the judgement, and this element in fact would seem to render the whole account not more, but less convincing and to emphasize the weakness of Anāthapiṇḍada's case and its irregularity. But the redactors of our account probably intended it otherwise, and probably assumed (perhaps wrongly) that their audience would react to the divine intervention in the same way as Anāthapiṇḍada did to the actions of the Devaputra Madhuskandha and be convinced of how important the building of a *vihāra* was — even the 'guardians of the world' engaged themselves to see that it happened, in spite, perhaps, of its illegality.

VIII.17Until this point the land in dispute and under purchase was called an *ārāma* or "park," and once an *udyāna* or "garden." Here for the first time it is called the "grove of Jeta," Jetavana, and this came to be the name most commonly used to refer to the entire 'complex,' and often to the *vihāra* itself (see, for example, the passage from the *Saṅghabheda* referring to the "plan of the Jetavana" cited

above IV n. 1, or the passage below — where devout pilgrims seek permission to also build something "in the Jetavana" (*vayam...jetavane kimcid vastu kārayema iti* — XVI, 33.13). This usage — which will be addressed below — is also irregular and may reflect in yet another way the irregularities involved in the 'purchase' of the Jetavana. A thorough study of the names of Buddhist monasteries in both texts and inscriptions will undoubtedly show, when undertaken, what Stein already noticed a long time ago in regard to both Gandhara and Kashmir, that the "*Vihāras* whose founders are referred to in Ou-K'ong's account, bore the names or titles of those who established them," and that for Kashmir "We are led to the same conclusion by an examination of the names which Kalhaṇa's chronicle has recorded of *Vihāras* founded in Kaçmir" (M.A. Stein, "Notes on Ou-K'ongs's Account of Kaçmir," *Sitzungsberichte der Philosophisch-Historischen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* 135 (1896) VII. 1-32, esp. 3-4 n. 1). By this pattern — which appears to be both old and well established — the *vihāra* established by Anāthapiṇḍada should have been named after him, not Jeta, but that is not the case, and as we will see immediately below, the tradition itself apparently felt some need to 'explain' this.

VIII.18 Gnoli's punctuation here might be particularly misleading; the text appears to be best taken as one long interrogative statement. The last clause — *na ca punar gopayitavyo bhaviṣyatīti* — is particularly elliptical. Its point seems to be that in giving a gift one does not incur a loss, but gains the benefit of not having to look after any longer that which was given away.

VIII.19 The first part of Jeta's statement echoes exactly Anāthapiṇḍada's response to the actions of the Devaputra Madhuskandha in VI above.

VIII.20 *dvārakoṣṭhaka* = *sgo khang* = "entrance hall." This is the same term already met with in III above in the passage giving the obligatory plan or layout of various types and sizes of *vihāras*, and although its exact nature is not — like so many of the architectural components of a *vihāra* — known, its importance or prominence is not in doubt. *BHSD* s.v. has already noted that it literally should mean "gate-room" and says that it is "a room, or (often) roofed but open space, over a gate or entrance...covered but open in front." But *BHSD* also notes that — "perhaps by extension" — it also "seems to be used in the sense of gate, entrance; and sometimes it is hard to say which is meant." In our text, however, "gate" is *dvāra*, as in the *śivikā-dvāra*, or "funereal gate," in VI above, and the use of the terms *dvāra* and *dvārakoṣṭhaka* in some other passages in our *Vinaya* would seem to mark a reasonably clear distinction. In, for example, the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* that is still embedded in the Mūlasarvāstivādin *Vinaya*, in the well-known account of the founding of Pāṭaliputra, when the minister Varṣākāra says he will name the "gate" by which the Buddha departs "Gautama's Gate," the term used both times is *dvāra* = *sgo* (*Mahāparinirvāṇa* (Waldschmidt) § 7.3); in the same text when Subhadra first sees Ānanda the latter is described as "walking on the ambulatory in the open air at the gate of the *ārāma* (*..ānanda ārāmadvāre 'bhyavakāśe caṅkrame caṅkramyate* § 40.7); and in a narrative cliché which says that one or another of the group of six was always hanging around the gate of the Jetavana so they could see who was coming to the "monastery" the term used is, again, always *dvāra* (*ācaritaṃ ṣaḍvargikāṇām aśūnyaṃ jetavanadvāram anyatamānyatamena ṣaḍvargikeṇa*, *Cīvaravastu*, GMs iii 2, 99.2; *Karmavastu*, GMs iii 2, 199.12; *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge Tha 101b.4; 232a.7, but especially *Vibhaṅga*, Derge Ca 205b.1). These and many other instances

would seem to indicate that the "gate" to a monastic complex, like the "gate" to a city, was called a *dvāra*, and this, therefore, is not what Jeta wished to build. He wanted to build a *dvārakoṣṭhaka*, and a *dvārakoṣṭhaka* appears not to have been the gate, or even the main gate to the monastic complex as a whole, but a part of the "monastery" building itself. III above indicates that the *dvārakoṣṭhaka* must be in the middle of the front wing of a quadrangular monastery facing and aligned with the "Perfume Chamber," which is in the center of the back wing, and this would seemingly of necessity mean that only a quadrangular *vihāra* had one — a single or three winged *vihāra* would in fact not have a wing facing the "Perfume Chamber" but would be open in front. This alignment obviously emphasizes the centrality of the *dvārakoṣṭhaka* in such a *vihāra*, and other texts equally emphasize in other ways its importance. There are texts, for example, which indicate that it must be kept free of mundane facilities, like the equivalent of our drinking fountains (*Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge Tha 109b.7), and others which forbid the presence there of 'unsightly' things like leprous monks, "smelling bad and covered with flies" (*Cīvaravastu*, GMs iii 2, 90.19). More positively, the importance of the *dvārakoṣṭhaka* is suggested in other texts by the fact that its location, together with the Perfume Chamber, was one of the first things to be determined in laying out a *vihāra* (*Vibhaṅga* Derge Ca 248b.1), or the fact that it was in the *dvārakoṣṭhaka* that monks first thought to display important royal donations given to the monastery (*Uttaragrantha*, Derge Pa 154b.6). But perhaps the fullest indication of the importance of the *dvārakoṣṭha* emerges in a series of mostly related texts dealing with paintings and their placement in a *vihāra*. Here we find both a clear distinction between the *dvāra* and the *dvārakoṣṭhaka*, and the apparent fact that the most religiously important paintings in the monastery are to be placed in the *dvārakoṣṭhaka*. The *Vibhaṅga*, for example, has an important text dealing with painting the wheel of rebirth and "the twelve limbs of conditioned co-production" (*pratītyasamutpada*) in the *vihāra* (Derge Ja 113b.3ff), a Sanskrit text for which is, fortunately, preserved now in the *Divyāvadāna* (*Divyāvadāna* 298.24ff), and the placement of this painting is clearly and explicitly mandated: it must be painted in the *dvārakoṣṭhaka* (*tasmād dvārakoṣṭhake pañcagaṇḍakaṃ cakraṃ kārayitavyaṃ*). Moreover, the text goes on to require that a competent (*pratibala*) monk be assigned to the *dvārakoṣṭhaka* to explain the painting to 'brahmins and householders' who come to the *vihāra* (*dvārakoṣṭhake bhikṣur uddeṣṭavyo ya āgatāgatānāṃ brāhmaṇagṛhapatīnāṃ darśayati* — for a translation of the corresponding Chinese text see J. Przyluski, "La roue de la vie à Ajaṇṭā," *Journal asiatique* (1920) 313-331, with citation of other relevant literature; for fragments of what appears to have been a similar Sanskrit text see B. Pauly, "Fragments sanskrits de haute asie (mission pelliot)," *Journal asiatique* (1959) 228-40). It is, however, not just the wheel of rebirth that is to be placed in the *dvārakoṣṭhaka*, nor is the *Vibhaṅga* the only text to talk about the paintings there. There is a text in the *Kṣudrakavastu* that deals even more extensively with the location of paintings in various parts of the *vihāra*. It is preserved in Tibetan (*Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge Tha 225a.3-226a.5 — treated most fully so far in M. Lalou, "Notes sur le décoration des monastères bouddhiques," *Revues des arts asiatiques*, 5.3 (1930) 183-85) and Chinese (see, for example, A.C. Soper, "Early Buddhist Attitudes toward the Art of Painting," *The Art Bulletin* 32 (1950) 149; E. Zürcher, "Buddhist Art in Medieval China: The Ecclesiastical View," in *Function and Meaning in Buddhist Art. Proceedings of a Seminar Held at Leiden University 21-24 October 1991*, ed. K.R. Van Kooij & H. van der Veere (Groningen: 1995) 6), and we even have now the Sanskrit text as it was digested by Guṇaprabha (*Vinayasūtra* (Sankrityayana) 114.16-.31). Here, first of all, the *dvāra* and *dvārakoṣṭhaka* are clearly distinguished and designated as the

locations for very different kinds of paintings. At or on the *dvāra* paintings of *yakṣas* "with hands holding *vajras*, etc." are to be painted (*dvāre yakṣāṇāṃ citraṇaṃ vajradharādihastānām* — the Sanskrit cited here and below is from the *Vinayasūtra*). The apotropaic function of such paintings — like those of all such *dvārapālas* — is not, of course, difficult to surmise. But the paintings to be placed in the *dvārakoṣṭhaka* are of a distinctly different type. They are first of all — as in the *Vibhaṅga* — the wheel of rebirth (*dvārakoṣṭhake saṃsāracakrasya*). But to this the *Kṣudrakavastu* adds "The Great Miracle," and the *Vinayasūtra* adds "The Defeat of Māra" as well (*sāmantakenāsya* [i.e. the *cakra*] *mahāprātihārya-mārabhaṅgayoḥ* — for the Tibetan texts of the *Vinayasūtra* and the four Indian commentaries on it see Derge, bstan 'gyur 'dul ba Wu 95a.5ff; Zu 258a.3ff; Yu 368a.7ff; Ru 256b.3ff; Lu 331b.6ff). These are doctrinally the most important and the most religiously charged paintings in the list. And they are all to be located in the *dvārakoṣṭhaka*. Everything then — the *dvārakoṣṭhaka's* architectural and quite literal centrality; the clear exclusion of certain kinds of things from it; and the presence in it of the monastery's most important paintings — seems to suggest that the *dvārakoṣṭhaka* was considered one of the most important components of a *vihāra*. What Jeta wished to construct was not, then, a mere appendage or secondary element of what was to come to be the new *vihāra*, but one of its central and most important component parts. The fact that this is what he both sought and received permission to do is odd — and virtually unique — if the resulting *vihāra* was unambiguously Anāthapiṇḍada's.

IX

IX.1 It does not seem difficult to determine what the redactors of our *Vinaya* thought — or least wanted their audience to think — about the kind of public demonstration of supernatural powers that is to follow here. They commonly add to their narratives a typical stenciled 'editorial insertion' (see above V n. 1) which makes that explicit: *āśu pṛthagjanāvarjanakarī ṛddhiḥ, so so'i skye bo dag ni rdzu 'phrul la myur du sems gtod par byed pa yin pas.*.(*Divyāvadāna* 133.9 = *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, Derge Ga 33b.4) or *āśu pṛthagjanasya ṛddhir āvarjanakarī, so so'i skye bo ni rdzu 'phrul la myur du sems gtod par byed pa yin pas* (*Divyāvadāna* 192.8 = *Vibhaṅga*, Derge Nya 70a.5). Fussman translates the latter form: "les miracles convertissent rapidement les gens simples" (G. Fussman, "*Upāya-kauśalya*. L'implantation du bouddhisme au gandhāra," in *Bouddhisme et cultures locales. Quelques cas de réciproques adaptations*, éd, F. Fukui & G. Fussman (Paris: 1994) 43n. 160); *BHSD*, s.v. *āvarjana*, renders the former: "magic converts the vulgar quickly" (citing also *Divyāvadāna* 313.15 and 539.5). The attitudes towards the public display of 'magical' powers in Buddhist literary sources are, however, considerably more complex — see Granoff, "The Ambiguity of Miracles," 79-96, for example.

IX.2 *tīrthya*; see above I n. 17.

IX.3 The Tibetan takes *kiṃ kāraṇam*? as a part of the speech of the members of other religious groups and this may be correct, or at least one good interpretation. The sometimes sparing use of 'speaker tags,' or the unmarked back and forth shifts of speakers in dialogue, is however, a characteristic of the style of our *Vinaya* and so I have taken it here.

IX.4 A similar practice among Buddhist monks themselves is referred to at *Cīvaravastu*, GMs iii 2, 109.16ff, although there *bhājita* is not used, and it is not cities that are, in effect, divided, but "families" or households. The division or assignment of households is effected by making a local monastic ordinance at the beginning of the rain retreat: *...bhikṣava idam evaṃ rūpaṃ kriyākāraṃ kṛtvā varṣā upagacchanti / amukaṃ kulaṃ yuṣmākam / amukaṃ kulam asmākam / rathyāvīthīcatvaraśṛṅgāṭakā madhyam iti /* "...Monks, having made a local monastic ordinance, undertake the rainy season retreat saying 'such-and-such family is yours, such-and-such family is ours, the roads, streets cross-roads and forks are neutral.'"

IX.5 *madīyaṃ svāpateyam = bdag gi nor.*

IX.6 *dharmaskandhaṃ kārayāmi = chos kyi phung po brtsig go.* The use here of *dharmaskandha* is very unusual though in some ways it approaches the sense discovered by Olivelle in an important passage in the *Chāndogya* (P. Olivelle, "*Dharmaskandhāḥ and Brahmasaṃsthaḥ.* A Study of *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* 2.23.1," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 116 (1996) 205-19. Here, however, *dharmaskandha* is almost certainly a noun and a *tatpuruṣa*, rather than Olivelle's *bahuvrīhi*, and the object of the verb *kārayāmi*, which the Tibetan has clearly taken to mean "build," rather than the more generic "make" or "do." The compound — following Olivelle as far as we can — would seem to mean something like "a trunk or torso for dharma," i.e. something which, like the trunk of a tree that supports branches and further growth, supports and allows the further growth of dharma. Notice too that in the *Chāndogya* as Olivelle reads it, those who are *dharmaskandha* (*bahuvrīhi*) "gain worlds earned by merit" (*puṇyalokāḥ*), and, as we will see, by building this *dharmaskandha* Anathāpiṇḍada is virtually assured of the same sort of thing; see below XI.

IX.7 For Sanskrit *dhvāṅkṣās...avikṛtavadanāḥ* the Tibetan has *spyi brtol can mu cor smra ba rnams kyis*, "impudent...talking nonsense."

IX.8 Sanskrit *pratibaddha*, but Tibetan *rag las par 'gyur.*

IX.9 Notice that the text is careful to say that Śāriputra had "focused his attention," *samanvāhṛtya*, because this is how *arhats* are able to know such things; cf. the discussion of the 'editorial insertion' in V n. 1 above.

IX.10 *bhadanta āryaśāriputraḥ.* But the Tibetan has *shes ldan dag shā ri'i bu.* The latter appears to have read *bhavantaḥ*, as a vocative of address to the *tīrthyas*, and to not have had an *ārya-* in their Sanskrit text.

IX.11 *kim atra prāptakālam.* But Tibetan: *de ma yin na dus der gdab ci dgos /.*

IX.12 *Raktākṣa = mig dmar.* A figure of the same name also occurs in the account of the defeat of the *tīrthyas* that is given in the version of The Great Miracle of Śrāvastī now preserved in Sanskrit in the *Divyāvadāna* under the title *Prātihārya-sūtra* (*Divyāvadāna* 143-66; translated in E. Burnouf,

Introduction a l'histoire du bouddhisme indien (Paris: 1844) 162-89). His role there, however, is much less central, and although the Sanskrit text of the *Prātihārya-sūtra* has numerous parallels in both narrative details and language with our text, its relationship to account of the Miracle of Śrāvastī found in our *Vinaya* (*Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge Da 40a.1ff) has yet to be worked out.

IX.13 *sabrahmacārin*. Buddhist monks use the same term for their fellow-monks in our *Vinaya*, as has already been noted above II n. 28.

IX.14 *kiyatā kālena* seems, again, to be a separate statement made by Raktākṣa, but see above n. 2. Here the Tibetan is less certain.

IX.15 *-āvakāśe*, but Tibetan *bla gab med* = *abhyavakāśe*.

IX.16 *kutūhalajāta* = *ngo mtshar skyes*. In II above exactly the same compound is used to describe King Brahmadatta when he began to wonder by whose "powerful effect" his kingdom was thriving — it is there also translated into Tibetan as *ngo mtshar skyes te*, and into English as "(I) have become very curious."

IX.17 *vādimaṇḍalam*; Gnoli cites his ms. as having *vādivaṇḍalaṃ*; Tibetan: *rtsod pa'i dkyil 'khor du*.

IX.18 *smitapūrvaṃ samaśānteneryāpathena*. But *smitapūrvam* as an isolated adverb here is syntactically odd and the Tibetan suggests a very different text. It has *dran pa sngon du btang ste / spyod lam zhi bas*...It makes no reference to "smiling," and in place of *smitapūrvam* seems to have read something like *pratimukhaṃ smṛtim upasthāpya*. Although the latter is far more typically translated as *dran pa mngon du bzhag nas* (*Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* (Waldschmidt) §§ 27.16; 30.16), *dran pa sngon du btang ste* is virtually as good. The Tibetan for our passage also seems to have nothing corresponding to *sama-*. But if the marked discrepancy between the Tibetan and Gnoli's Sanskrit might raise some suspicions about the latter, it is not the only thing that might. According to a narrative cliché — one example of which occurs not far below in the *Śayanāsana* itself (XI) — Buddhas and disciples of Buddha never smile without a cause (*nāhetvapratyayam...tathāgatā vā tathāgataśrāvakā vā smitaṃ prāviṣkurvanti*), and when they do smile that is noted, and the cause or reason is explained, as it is below when Śāriputra definitely smiles, and as it is elsewhere (see, for example, *Saṅghabhedavastu* ii 161-63; 172; 173; *Avadāna-çataka* (Feer) 10-12 — the cliché occurs twenty times in the first three decades of the text). But here neither occurs and that makes the reading that much more suspicious. There are at least good reasons to suspect that Gnoli might have misread here, or that the manuscript tradition itself might be faulty. But neither is certain.

IX.19 *vikariṣyatha*. The Tibetan translates as *'jig*, which goes more strongly toward "destroy."

IX.20 *indrajāla* = *mig 'phrul*. The former literally means "The Net of Indra," but is commonly used for "magic," "illusion," "jugglery," etc. The Tibetan is not a literal translation: "eye trick."

IX.21*vetāda* = *ro langs;* see now S. Dietz, "The Meaning of *kṛtya-kākhorda-mantra-vetāda*," in *Dharmadūta. Mélanges offerts au Vénérable Thích Huyên-Vi*, ed. Bhikkhu Tampalawela Dhammaratana & Bhikkhu Pāsādika (Paris: 1997) 82-94.

IX.22*mantraiḥ kīlitaḥ* = *sngags kyi phur pas btab pa.* The verb here is presumably part of a technical vocabulary of 'sorcery' or 'conjuring.'

IX.23Because the Sanskrit text reads *vetāda ātmavadhāya cetayate*, which should mean "The zombie was intent on killing himself," and because the rest of the incident is narrated almost exclusively through the use of pronouns whose referents must be surmised, the meaning is ambiguous. At first sight it appears that it is the zombie who wants to kill himself, but then the *sa tasyaivopari pradhāvitaḥ*, "He (the zombie) rushed upon that very one," makes no sense, and "that very one" must refer to Raktākṣa. Moreover, unless *tasya* and the following *asau* refer to Raktākṣa, it would be the zombie who entered the order and became an *arhat*, and that seems unlikely. It seems best to take *ātma-* of *ātma-vadhāya* and *tasyaivo* as both referring to Raktākṣa. Conceptually it is of course possible that the *vetāda* conjured up by Raktākṣa was considered to be an extension of himself.

IX.24Gnoli reads *śaraṇāgato 'smi* and this could be correct. The Tibetan, however, has here *skyabs su mchi lags kyis* and this is exactly the same as its translation of *ahaṃ...śaraṇaṃ gacchāmi* above in VI where Anāthapiṇḍada becomes a lay brother. Moreover, in this same passage dealing with Anāthapiṇḍada where Gnoli read *śaraṇāgata*, as here, both Wille and Dutt read *śaraṇagata* (VI n. 37), and the Tibetan again has *skyabs su mchi ba*. **Read:** *śaraṇagato 'smi.*

IX.25The text here has only *tasya* — I have supplied what I take to be its referent.

IX.26*prasādajāta* = *dad pa skyes nas.*

IX.27A cliché, though overwhelmingly said to the Buddha himself and not, as here, to a disciple.

IX.28Virtually the whole of this paragraph is a cliché found repeatedly in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, the *Avadānaśataka* and the *Divyāvadāna*. Elements of it have caused trouble, *vāsīcandanakalpa*, for example, which seems to identify having ones body rubbed with sandal paste and having it scraped with an adze (see M. Bloomfield, "Notes on the *Divyāvadāna*," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 40 (1920) 336-52, esp. 339-43; K.R. Norman, "Middle Indo-Aryan Studies (I)," *Journal of the Oriental Institute* (Baroda) 9 (1960) 268-73, esp. 269-71 [=*Collected Papers*, Vol. I (Oxford: 1990) 15-20, esp.]. Note too the passages in P. Olivelle, *Rules and Regulations of Brahmanical Asceticism. Yatidharmasamuccaya of Yādava Prakāśa* (Albany: 1995) 7.23; 7.85 [8.66: *samamṛtkāñcana*]), and either *'vidyā-* or *vidyā-vidāritāṇḍakośa* (Bloomfield, "Notes," 340; V. Näther, C. Vogel and K. Wille, "The Final Leaves of the *Pravrajyāvastu* Portion of the *Vinayavastu* Manuscript Found Near Gilgit. Part 1 *Saṃgharakṣitāvadana*," *Sanskrit-Texte aus dem buddhistischen Kanon: Neuentdeckungen und Neueditionen III* (Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden. Beiheft 6), G. Bongard-Levin et al (Göttingen: 1996) 288 n. 123; 290 n. 137). The Tibetan in our passage for the second of these compounds is in Tog *rig*

pa'i ma rig pa'i sgo nga'i sbubs dral cing, but in Derge *rig pas ma rig pa'i sgo nga'i*, etc., whereas the Tibetan for the *Pravrajyāvastu* passages just referred to is *rig pas sgo nga'i sbubs dral bar gyur cing*. This is symptomatic of the continuing uncertainties regarding the 'correct' form in both languages, and in light of this uncertainty, and in the absence of a comprehensive study of both the cliché and the manuscripts that deliver it, it seemed best to follow Gnoli's reading of the Sanskrit here, while, of course, reserving any final judgment. In specific regard to the occurence of the cliché here note that Gnoli has read in both the *Śayanāsana* and *Saṅghabheda bhavalābhalobhaparāṅmukhaḥ*, but on the next page the standard form occurs: *bhavalābhalobhasatkāraparāṅmukhaḥ*. This, the standard form, confirmed by both Tibetans *(bkur sti)*, would seem to suggest that *-satkāra-* has dropped out of our text and should be restored. **Read:** *bhavalābhalobhasatkāraparāṅmukhaḥ*. — The Sanskrit for "knowledge, supernatural knowledge, and special knowledge were obtained" is *vidyābhijñāpratisaṃvitprāpta*. *abhijñā* and *pratisaṃvit* have, of course, specific technical meanings, but it is hard to know how much of such meanings would have been felt in what had become a cliché. — *upendra* should probably mean here "the younger brother of Indra," but as such it is as applied to a variety of divine figures.

IX.29 *abhiprasanna* = *mngon par dad par gyur te*. Here, however, we have some additional indication of the nature of the state that the term *abhiprasanna* expresses: that state here is explicitly linked with wide-eyed amazement — *vismayotphullalocana*.

IX.30 Gnoli prints *vādirṛṣabho* in the *Śayanāsana*, but *vādivṛṣabho* in the *Saṅghabheda*. Since the text of the former is at this point supposed to have been supplied by the latter something is obviously wrong here. Given the oddity of *vādirṛṣabho* it is obviously best to take it as a mere misprint. The Tibetan has *smra ba'i khyu mchog*. **Read:** *vādivṛṣabho*.

IX.31 The form *avalokika* is problematic but printed as such in both *Śayanāsana* and *Saṅghabheda*. Tibetan: *lta bar gyur to*.

IX.32 From here to the end of this paragraph the text is made up almost entirely of clichés.

IX.33 *mahān viśeṣa* = *khyad par chen po*. "Great distinction" is sometimes used alone, with no further explanation or — as here — enumeration, to express religious achievement. See, for example, *Avadānaśataka* (Speyer) i 242.1, 260.3; ii 33.17, 136.2.

X

X.1 *bhṛtikayā karma kurmaḥ* = *gla mi'i las byas la*. Although they allow — when necessary — the participation of monks in construction work on religious structures, the redactors of our *Vinaya* seem to have taken it very much for granted that, under normal circumstances, *vihāras* were built by paid laborers (see, for examples, *Vibhaṅga*, Derge Ca 146a.2ff *(gla mi)* and Ca 246b.6ff *(gla mi)*. In these texts, as in ours, it was the monk who was acting as "assistant" *(sahāyaka)* or "assistant for religion/merit" *(dharma-/puṇyasahāya)* who was in charge of the labor force. Note, incidentally, that according to our *Vinaya* the houses of at least the wealthy were also built by paid labor, and such

laborers are described as a rough and dirty sort; see *Vibhaṅga*, Derge Ja 116b.6ff = *Divyāvadāna* 303.30ff: *sphatitaparuṣā* [but correct to: *sphuṭitaparuṣā* cf. *Saṅghabhedavastu* i 76.7] *rūkṣakeśā malinavastranivasanāḥ*, "chapped and rough, with dirty hair, and wearing filthy clothes." This description is of interest here because it indicates what these *tīrthyas* agreed to become, and gives some idea how low they have stooped. Not only would such figures be extremely unattractive to an Indian audience of any refinement, but the fact that they undertook paid labor of this sort would make them even more vile.

X.2*tvadīyavihāra* = *khyod kyi gtsug lag khang*. The implications of the wording here for the question of the ownership of *vihāras* will become clearer below.

X.3*latāvārikaḥ puruṣo* = *lcag thogs kyi mi*. The Sanskrit literally means "the man in charge of the whip," and the Tibetan is close to that. This may indicate a little more fully what wage labor was like. This individual is not commonly — perhaps, not otherwise — referred to, but presumably if one could not, like Śāriputra, conjure one up, he too would have to be hired.

X.4*caṅkramyamāṇas tiṣṭhati*.

X.5The second of Wille's fragmentary leaves starts here; it is numbered 322.

X.6Gnoli reads *abhidrutā*, but Wille has *vidrutā* and the Tibetan has *thag bcug pa*. **Read**: *vidrutā*.

X.7The form of address here is odd, but although misprinted in the *Śayanāsana* as *āyuśman*, the *Saṅghabheda* has *āyuṣman* and the Tibetan confirms this: *tshe dang ldan pa*. Since *āyuṣmat* is a form of address almost always applied to monks, the easiest explanation may be that the work-boss conjured up by Śāriputra was, in spite of his "frightful" aspect, in appearance a monk. Certainly, the *navakarmika*, "the monk in charge of new construction" is, for example, one of the earliest monastic offices referred to in inscriptions (see M. Njammasch, "Der navakammika und seine Stellung in der Hierarchie der buddhistischen Klöster," *Altorientalische Forschungen 1* (1974) 279-93 — unfortunately the textual material here is limited to Pāli), but we normally do not think of such a monastic officer as a whip-toting bully. Our passage, however, may at least be hinting at the fact that on some occasions he might well have been something very like that; cf. the behavior of the senior monk below (XXXI, 43.4ff) who is described as *niṣṭhura*, "harsh, cruel," and who throws a sick junior monk out of a cell without repercussion.

X.8*maitracitta*.

X.9*abhiprasanna* = *dad par gyur to*.

X.10This entire paragraph and the next one as well are made up of clichés.

X.11*satkāyadṛṣṭi* = *'jig tshogs la lta ba*; see J. Rahder, "La satkāyadṛṣṭi d'après Vibhāṣā, 8," *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques 1* (1931-1932) 227-39; C.A. Scherrer-Schaub, *Yuktiṣaṣṭikāvṛtti*.

Commentaire à la soixantaine sur le raisonnement ou Du vrai enseignement de la causalité par le Maître indien Candrakīrti (Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques 25) (Bruxelles: 1991) 137 n. 99; 166 n. 201; 208 n. 364.

X.12 Here, as already noted (IX n. 27), Gnoli reads *bhavalābhalobhasatkāraparāṅmukha-*, which is what is normally found in this cliché, but it is worth pointing out that in translating the Sanskrit compound I have, with some reluctance, followed the Tibetan understanding of it: *srid pa dang / rnyed pa la chags pa dang / bkur sti la rgyab kyis phyogs pa /*. The Tibetan has apparently taken *bhava* and *lābha* as a *dvandva* which is the object of an accusative *tatpuruṣa, bhava-lābha-lobha,* and then seen the *tatpuruṣa* and *satkāra* as another *dvandva*, etc. It might be more 'natural' to in fact take *bhava-lābha-lobha-satkāra-* as a simple four membered *dvandva* and translate "their backs were turned on the world, donations, avarice and honor."

XI

XI.1 *vihārasūtra* = *gtsug lag khang gi thig skud.* Though context is probably enough to make it clear what is meant here by *vihārasūtra*, the Tibetan makes it all but certain: Jäschke gives for *thig* alone "carpenter's cord or string to mark lines with, marking-string.." (he also gives *thig skod* as "string to mark lines with;" see also Das who cites the form *thig skor* as "carpenter's cord," etc., and *thig skud* as "*sūtra*, thread, yarn; also straight line"). Śāriputra and Anāthapiṇḍada are here laying out and marking the site with the plan of the *vihāra.*

XI.2 In both *Śayanāsana* and *Saṅghabheda* Gnoli punctuates: *...tena hi punaḥ sūtraṃ prasāraya bhūyasyā mātrayā; cittam abhiprasādayāmīti;* but both sense and the Tibetan *(...de lta na de'i slad du yang thig skud brkyang ba dang lhag par sems mngon par dad par bgyi'o /)* would seem to require that the adverbial phrase go with *cittam abhiprasādayāmi.* Note too that here again — as above X n. 28 — the state expressed by *abhiprasādayāmi* is linked with wide-eyed amazement.

XI.3 *anāthapiṇḍadena gṛhapatinā bhūyasyā mātrayā tīvreṇa prasādavegena cittam abhiprasāditam* = *khyim bdag mgon med zas sbyin gyis lhag par dad pa drag po'i shugs kyis sems mngon par dad par byas te /*. Notice here that regardless of how the various derivatives from *pra√sad* are nuanced, there remains a clear and distinct pattern: the more the *prasāda* increases the more Anāthapiṇḍada gives; the more he is moved the greater his gifts.

XI.4 Gnoli reads *yena prasādajātena samanantaram eva*, but Wille: *yena prasādasamanantaram eva;* Tibetan: *dad pa de'i mjug thogs kho nar.* The 'correct' reading here remains uncertain.

XI.5 This account is a narrativization or dramatization of an idea expressed much more prosaically elsewhere in our *Vinaya.* At *Saṅghabheda* ii 206.19 we find, for example: *punar aparaṃ yaḥ pudgalaḥ apratiṣṭhitapūrve pṛthivīpradeśe cāturdiśasya bhikṣusaṅghasya vihāram pratiṣṭhāpayati; ayam dvitīyaḥ pudgalaḥ brāhmam puṇyam prasavati; kalpaṃ svargeṣu modate,* "Moreover, that person who establishes a *vihāra* for the Community of Monks from the Four Directions on a spot

which has had no previous foundations, this is the second person who produces the merit of Brahmā — he delights in the heavens for an eon" (for 'the merit of Brahmā' see P. Pradhan, *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam* (Patna; 1975) 274.7; L. de La Vallée Poussin, *L'Abhidharmakośa* (Paris: 1923-31) T. III, 250-51; Bhikkhu Pāsādika, *Kanonische Zitate im Abhidharmakośabhāṣya des Vasubandhu* (Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden. Beiheft 1) (Göttingen: 1986) 93; U. Pagel, *The Bodhisattvapiṭaka. Its Doctrine, Practices and Their Position in Mahāyāna Literature* (Buddhica Britannica. Series Continua V) (Tring: 1995) 139 n. 77; 374).

XI.6 *mahallikā vihārā* = *gtsug lag khang chen po.*

XI.7 *kuṭikāvastu* = *khang phran.* When Śuddhodana has a *vihāra* built in Kapilavastu after Udāyin draws for him the plans of the Jetavana, he too has sixteen large *vihāras* and sites for sixty huts built "according to the plan of the Jetavana;" see IV n. 1 above.

XI.8 The same sort of curious exchange occurs in the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, for example, when Ānanda asks how the funereal "honors for the body" are to be performed for the Buddha. He is told by the latter: *tadyathānanda rājñaś cakravartino yathā.* But then Ānanda — as here — has to ask: *kathaṃ bhadanta rājñaś cakravartinaḥ* (*Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* (Waldschmidt) §§ 36.1-.6). At least narratively, neither Ānanda nor Anāthapiṇḍada seem to know very much about *cakravartins.*

XI.9 Gnoli: *vāsakān:* but Wille *(vā) / sakaṃ.* Wille is unsure: "Lies mit SBV I 178.9 *vāsakān?*" The Tibetan has *gshegs dgongs*, something like "going until evening" — Jäschke gives *dgong(s)* by itself as "a day's journey." Sanskrit *vāsaka* in this sense seems not to be well attested, but see *BHSD* s.v. *udghātika*, which cites and discusses the compound *vāsodghātikā* that occurs at *Divyāvadāna* 173.20 and .24 (in neither case, however, does the Tibetan appear to have a clear equivalent — *Vibhaṅga*, Derge Nya 21b.7).

XI.10 *parikramaṇakā* = *(g)zhes dag.* This is another term whose form and meaning in our text are not well attested elsewhere. It does, however, occur several further times in the *Śayanāsana.* At XXXV (49.12ff) Anāthapiṇḍada gets authorization from the Buddha to build *parikramaṇakas* between Srāvastī and the Jetavana where monks could eat their meals. Anāthapiṇḍada also is said to have had wells made there, and to have provided spices and fruits. At least the wells were administered by monks who were ordered to allow lay persons access to them. At XXXVII (51.10ff) it is further said that alms that were given to the Jetavana came mostly to be given at the *parikramaṇakas* once they were built. But whereas in our current passage *parikramaṇaka* is translated into Tibetan by *(g)zhes*, in these latter passages it is always rendered by *bsti gnas*, and a very similar translation — *bsti ba'i gnas* — is found in the Tibetan text of the *Vinayasūtra* for *pratikramaṇaka-*, the Sanskrit term Guṇaprabha uses in digesting *Śayanāsana* 49.12ff (*Vinayasūtra* (Sankrityayana) 110.25 = Derge bstan 'gyur, 'dul ba Wu 92b.1). Jäschke in fact gives *sti (ba'i) gnas* as "resting place." Although, then, the Sanskrit form is unsettled, its meaning, following the Tibetan, cannot be in serious doubt. Oddly enough, however, in the largely parallel account of the founding of the Ghoṣilārama in the *Vibhaṅga* (Derge Nya 141b.1) Ghoṣila is said to have had *gshegs dgongs sa dag* prepared along the Buddha's route, indicating even further variation within Tibetan sources.

XI.1 [1]*kālārocakaḥ puruśaḥ* **[Read:** *puruṣaḥ***]** = *dus tshod gsol ba'i mi dag* (the Tibetan is marked plural). Passages like this and those discussed in Schopen, "Marking Time in Buddhist Monasteries," 157ff, point toward an India that was much more time conscious than has generally been allowed.

XI.1 [2]*śobhita*. Aesthetic values and a sense of beauty play prominent roles in our *Vinaya*. This perhaps could not be made clearer than it is in the text from the *Kṣudrakavastu* cited above in VIII n. 20 that deals with paintings in the *vihāra*. The reason that is given for allowing such paintings in a *vihāra* is, quite simply, because without them a *vihāra* "is not beautiful" (*'di ri mo ma bris pas mi sdug ste* (Derge Tha 225a.4). But virtually the same reason is given in the *Uttaragrantha* for plastering a *stūpa* (*...rdo thal gyis ma byugs kyi bar du mi mdzes par gyur na*, Derge Pa 114b.1) or adding gateways *(toraṇa)* to the railing surrounding it (*... rta babs med pa dang mi mdzes par gyur te*, 115a.4; see also XIV n.16 below). Even a certain cut of the monastic robes is justified by the fact that without it "they are not beautiful" (*na śobhante* — *Cīvaravastu*, GMs iii 2, 50.16; see also the paper referred to in n. 35 of the Introduction). For the value placed on human physical beauty see above I n. 6; for the physical beauty of the Buddha, below XIII ns. 2, 4.

XI.1 [3]Most of what follows here are clichés.

XI.1 [4]Note that the commitment on the part of the 'donor' here (i.e. Anāthapiṇḍada) to in effect maintain the monks who live in the monastery he founded is — as it commonly is in such narratives — for life (*yāvajjīvam*). This 'obligation' on the part of the donor will in fact be taken up in more general terms again below XXIII (37.6ff). But it is important to note that the redactors of our *Vinaya* took it nervously for granted that the 'obligation' was not inherited by, or binding on, the founder's heirs upon his death; see, for example, *Vibhaṅga*, Derge Cha 184a.1 where "a devout and good householder" founded a beautiful *vihāra* — "it captivated both the heart and the eye," not be it noted, the head (see n. 11 above) — and maintained sixty monks who lived there. But on his death when the monks asked his son (heir) if he would continue to do so, and the son said he had to decline, the monks had to abandon the *vihāra* — notice that it was assumed that it was the monks who were obliged to go to the heir to seek a continuance of support (i.e. it was not automatic), and it was assumed that the heir was not under obligation to do so and could decline (the text makes no adverse judgement — in fact no judgement at all — in regard to the son). If Buddhist monasteries were actually funded in this way they would have been very vulnerable institutions. Both may very well have been true, and this, in turn, may account for the strong emphasis found at least in our *Vinaya* on the need to secure donations.

XII

XII.1 This entire section is again made up of a series of narrative clichés — for other examples, see *Saṅghabheda:* 188.3ff; *Vibhaṅga*, Derge Nya 141b.5ff; *Divyāvadana* 125.24ff; 148.7ff; 182.1ff; *Avadānaśataka* (Speyer) i 108.1ff. However stereotyped or stenciled such passages are they are not unimportant. They may in fact represent the crystallization of a conception of the Buddha that was

current from the early centuries of the Common Era, if not before, a conception that was mainstream during, for example, the formative period of 'early' Buddhist art. Although what he takes to be chronological differences may just as easily be sectarian or even geographical in origin, Étienne Lamotte has made a start on getting some sense of this conception (Lamotte, *Histoire du bouddhisme indien* 713ff), but much remains to be done here. Lamotte wants, for example, to contrast what he calls "Le Buddha divinisé" with the Buddha "dans les vieux textes canoniques," but what he is actually contrasting is the Buddha of Sanskrit ("Northern") sources with the Buddha of *some* Pāli sources, and that of course is a very different matter. The fact that his "Deified Buddha" occurs in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* makes it perfectly 'canonical,' as does its occurrence elsewhere in the literature of other 'schools' (see A. Bareau, "The Superhuman Personality of the Buddha and Its Symbolism in the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* of the Dharmaguptaka," in *Myths and Symbols: Studies in Honor of Mircea Eliade* (Chicago: 1969) 9-22.

XII.2Wille's fragmentary leaf no. 322 ends here. "Beautiful" translates *prāsādika* = *dang ba*.

XII.3The first leaf of Gnoli's continuous ms. for the *Śayanāsana* starts here and is numbered 323.

XII.4*samantatobhadraka* = *kun nas mdzes pa*.

XII.5*sābhisaṃskāraṃ*; see *BHSD* s.v. which says "chiefly in *Divy[āvadāna]*," which means in effect 'chiefly in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.'

XII.6The text has only *lokāntarikā* and I have added "the otherwise always dark" because this would have been known, almost certainly, by the audience, and because it is necessary to fully appreciate the truly extraordinary nature of the event. *BHSD* s.v. says: "interstice(s) between the worlds; they are dark, gloomy places, a kind of purgatories," and gives detailed treatment of a part of the cliché. It omits, however, an additional part — omitted also in our text — which might justify his use of the term "purgatories." At *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* (Kern & Nanjio) 163.11, for example, we find the following statement after the description of the penetration of light into the intermediate spaces: *ye 'pi tāsu lokāntarikāsu sattvā upapannās te 'py anyonyam evaṃ paśyanty anyonyam evaṃ saṃjānanti / anye 'pi bata bhoḥ sattvāḥ santīhopapannāḥ / anye 'pi bata bhoḥ sattvāḥ santīhopapannā iti*, "those individuals who had been reborn in the intermediate spaces, they too saw each other [for the first time], were aware of each other, saying 'look here! Other individuals have also been reborn here ...'" As this instance illustrates elements of the cliché found in our text also occur widely in Mahāyāna *sūtra* literature.

XII.7*āścarya* = *ya mtshan*.

XII.8Gnoli emends as *krośanti*, citing the ms. as *krodheti*. But in *Saṅghabheda* he prints without note: *krauñcanti*. Tibetan is of no help, having in both texts *yang skad 'byin* (it also translates the next two verbs as well with *yang skad 'byin*!)

XII.9 Gnoli prints *vāditrabāṇḍāni*, but since he prints *vāditrabhāṇḍāni* in *Saṅghabheda* this is presumably a misprint. Tibetan has *rol mo'i cha spyad.*

XII.10 The last part of this cliché must have been a particularly powerful trope. Elements of it keep showing up, as Lamotte has already noted, in a variety of Mahāyāna *sūtras* (*Histoire du bouddhisme indien*, 715 n. 4), and its implications may indeed be very far reaching. Simply put, this cliché establishes that the presence of the Buddha — his entrance into a place — has powerful curative and transformative effects. That being so, any 'equivalent' or 'substitute' of the Buddha must have the same effects. In the case of what we call 'images,' for example, the implications are clear enough: if in some essential way the image of the Buddha was thought to be the Buddha himself — and there is good evidence to suggest it was or could be (see, for example, G. Schopen, "The Buddha as an Owner of Property and Permanent Resident in Medieval Indian Monasteries," *JIP* 18 (1990) 181-217) — then bringing it/him into a place, more specifically a town, must — in light of our cliché — take on a very specific meaning, and our *Vinaya* has two long sets of rules governing just such an image procession (*Uttaragrantha*, Derge Pa 137b.4 - 140a.7; 175b.1 - 177b.7, and a digest of both passages has come down to us in Sanskrit, *Vinayasūtra* (Sankrityayana) 120.25 - 121.12 — the key wording in the latter is *nagarapraveśe cāsyāṣ karaṇam* — a translation of the canonical rules governing image processions will appear in the paper "On Sending the Monks back to their Books: Cult and Conservatism in Early Mahāyāna Buddhism" which will be Chapter IV of G. Schopen, *Figments and Fragments of a Mahāyāna Buddhism in India* (Honolulu: 2002)). But our cliché also has the same sorts of implications for other 'equivalents' of the Buddha, and a particularly striking instance may occur in our text below at XXXII (45.22). There the Buddha is made to say that he himself dwells in that region *(diś)* in which a person who preserves the *Vinaya (vinayadhara)* lives, that he is not absent from that region, and that that region is — significantly in light of our cliché — filled with his light, radiance and splendor. The curative or transformative power of such a place would therefore be considerable.

Two points need here to be emphasized. First the operative idea here — the powerful effects of the Buddha's presence — is expressed in a cliché and is therefore by definition common and widely current. Second, with such ideas so firmly established in mainstream sources it is not at all clear what, if anything, a movement like the Mahāyāna had to offer in this particular and important area. There, again, may have been no felt need for it in India (cf. G. Schopen, "The Mahāyāna and the Middle Period in Indian Buddhism: Through a Chinese Looking-glass," *The Eastern Buddhist* 32.2 (2000) 24.

XIII

XIII.1 *mahatā satkāreṇa.* Exactly the same expression is used in the *Vinayasūtra* in regard to the 'procession' by which an image of the Buddha is brought into town (see above XII n. 10), and the commentary attributed to Dharmamitra, in particular, suggests that, in so far as it was possible, the 'procession' was to mimic elements of the description found in our cliché — he refers, for example, to those who have assumed the appearance of (presumably, dressed up as) gods scattering flowers (*de la lha'i gzugs byas ba dag gis me tog dag 'thor ba dang* ...Derge btsan 'gyur Yu 388a.4 — could

the still puzzling Śiva "mask" published in G. Fussman, "Le 'masque court': une effigie en laiton de śiva au gandhara," *Journal Asiatique* (1991) 137-74, have been connected with such a Buddhist procession?)

XIII.2 "Similarly the pouring of water by the donor became the most significant part of the giftmaking rite. Without it no gift could be considered complete;" so V. Nath, *Dāna: Gift System in Ancient India. A Socio-Economic Perspective* (New Delhi: 1987) 218 & notes with references to both *dharmaśāstra* and Buddhist sources. The "vase" and the ritual of pouring water is the central focus of the composition in one of the earliest representations of "The Gift of the Jetavana" in Buddhist art, a frequently reproduced, labelled relief from Bharhut (see, for example, Sharma, *Bharhut Sculptures* 24-25). — The text here has only *vāridhārāṃ pātayitum ārabdhaḥ*, "(He) started to pour the stream of water;" I have added "of donation."

XIII.3 Since he could not pour the water he could not complete the gift (see previous note) — another of the narrative curiosities in this account, as is the expression *sāpakṣālāni karmāṇi* which is used to express what Anāthapiṇḍada thought he might have done. The term *apakṣāla* is not common and even its etymology is badly understood. *BHSD* s.v. gives for it "fault, defect, failing, sin," and the Tibetan renders *sāpakṣālāni karmāṇi* as *las nyes pa dang bcas pa,* "an act which is connected with a moral fault (or "offence" or "sin" or "crime")," so the approximate meaning cannot be very far off from this. Then there is the fact that Anāthapiṇḍada is described as "feeling badly" — *durmanas* — and an Indian reader of the text could, as already indicated, have naturally assumed that he had good reason to both feel this way and to think he had committed a fault: he had just duped a minor out of a piece of property that did not legally belong to him, and this action had been confirmed by a prejudicial court. Indeed, this curious incident — in fact the whole of the remaining account — is probably best seen as an attempt on the part of the redactors of our *Vinaya* to explain and to justify what they saw as the legal and ethical difficulties that were embedded in what must have been the 'old' account of the 'purchase' of the Jetavana that had come down to them. Notice that they deftly have Anāthapiṇḍada entertain a suspicion that they themselves might well have had, or that they could anticipate their audience already having arrived at.

XIII.4 The reason given here for the water not pouring might not have great explanatory powers, but that was probably not its main function. The whole incident, in fact, appears to have been solely devised so that the Buddha himself could declare publically that — in spite of good evidence to the contrary — Anāthapiṇḍada had not acted wrongly or illegally.

XIII.5 The Sanskrit for these last two paragraphs is once again oddly allusive, and once again, given the irregularities in both the purchase and the double name assigned to the place, this is most likely intentional. But the net effect perpetuated and formalized the ambiguity. By putting Jeta's name first — where it is always found in the texts — the Buddha left the impression at least that he was the first donor, and by pattern and implication, the real owner.

XIII.6 *atīvābhiprasanna,* which is here translated by *shin tu dga' bar gyur te* (see the material cited from the *Avadānaśataka* in V n. 18 above), and linked directly with both *prīti* and *prāmodya (dga'*

ba and rab tu dga' ba), "delight" and "joy." Characteristically, here too the feeling results in an even more elaborate donation.

XIII.7 *tathā saṃgītakārair [Saṅghabheda: saṅgītikārair] api sthaviraiḥ [Saṅghabheda: -ais] sūtra [Saṅghabheda: sūtranta] upanibaddham bhagavān śrāvastyāṃ viharati jetavane 'nāthapiṇḍadasyārame iti = de bzin du sdud pa byed pa rnams kyis kyang / mdo sde'i nang du sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das rgyal bu rgyal byed kyi tshal mgon med zas sbyin gyi kun dga' ra ba na bzhugs so zhes gdags pa byas so /* . This is another 'editorial insertion' of a particular type and stencilled form (cf. V n. 1 above) found almost exclusively in association with events in the biography of the Buddha. It occurs widely. In addition to the present passage (*Śayanāsana* 27.15 = Derge Ga 205b.6) see *Saṅghabheda* i 166.12 = Derge Da 79a.3; i 181.14 = Da 89b.4; i 199.28 = Da 101b.7; *Cīvaravastu*, GMs iii 2, 9.4 = Derge Ga 53a.2 = von Schiefner, *Tibetan Tales* 79; GMs iii 2, 70.10 = Ga 79b.4 = von Schiefner, *Tibetan Tales* 125; *Divyāvadāna* 274.13 = *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge Tha 20b.5; *Kṣudrakavastu*, Derge Tha 97a.2 = W.W. Rockhill, *The Life of the Buddha and the Early History of His Order* (London: 1907) 121, where the insertion is omitted altogether; etc. There is — as there always is with such formulae — a certain amount of variation in the precise wording of the insertion, the most important of which are: *saṃgītikāra* is usually omitted (Gnoli's *saṃgītakāra* is almost certainly an error — for the *Śayanāsana* too **Read**: *saṃgītikāra*); and rather than *sūtra*, as in our text, *sūtrānta* (i.e. *sūtrānte*) or *sūtrānteṣu* is far more commonly found (in fact Gnoli's *sūtra* in our passage is unique and should perhaps be emended). Apart from these variations the formulae is, of course, adapted to the particular context in which it occurs so that the phrase starting *bhagavān*...and ending with *iti* is different in every case; e.g. rather than *bhagavān śrāvastyāṃ viharati jetavane*, etc, as in our text, we could have *bhagavān rājagṛhe viharanti veṇuvane*, etc..

This formulaic insertion is of particular interest. It may provide a small but rare bit of evidence for how a reader of this *Vinaya* might have understood his text, and the texts of any *sūtras* he might have read, both as texts and the products of a redactional process, since the term *upanibaddha* almost certainly is referring to some such process. Apart from correcting *upanirbaddha* — which Cowell & Neil print at *Divyāvadāna* 274.14 — to *upanibaddha*, *BHSD* s.v. does not, however, treat the term, saying only "written, recorded; surely error for Skt. *upanibaddha*." The Tibetan translations are helpful here, even though not entirely consistent. They overwhelmingly render *upanibaddha* as *gdags pa byas so*, as in our passage, which means most basically "to bind, fasten, tie to...to fix, attach." But *brjod do*, "to say, pronounce...promulgate, set forth," *nye bar sbyar ro*, which here almost certainly means "to compile, compose," and *bris so*, "to write," also occur. Reference to the 'fixing,' 'writing,' 'compiling,' of the *sūtrantas*, combined always with a reference to "Elders," and occasionally to Elders who had rehearsed the texts, would almost of necessity have referred the reader to one or more redactions of the canon that the tradition knew. But even more than that, a reader would not have to have been unduly perceptive to notice that since *his text* refers to that redaction as a past event — *upanibaddha* is a past passive participle — *it* could not have been an actual part of that redaction, and must itself be still later. In other words this 'editorial insertion' inserts between the reader and the text he had before him several chronological removes. He would have, or could have, been aware of the fact that he was separated even from the original redaction of events by at least one further redaction that referred to it, and by possibly more, depending on what he took *upanibaddha* to refer to. Some of these issues have been discussed elsewhere in a preliminary

way (Schopen, *Daijō bukkyō kōki jidai: Indo no sōin seikatsu*, 50-70), but they deserve and require a much fuller treatment.

The 'repetition' of the *Śayanāsanavastu* that occurs in the *Saṅghbhedavastu* ends after the 'editorial insertion;' i.e. it runs from VI through XIII.

XIV

XIV.1 A cliché; also below in XV.

XIV.2 *pṛthivīpradeśa*.

XIV.3 Vipaśyin and the series of named Buddhas that follow constitute, of course, the standard list of Śākyamuni's distant predecessors; for some discussion of them, from very different angles, see J.Ph. Vogel, "The Past Buddhas and Kāśyapa in Indian Art and Epigraphy," *Asiatica. Festschrift Friedrich Weller* (Leipzig: 1954) 808-16; R.G. Gombrich, "The Significance of Former Buddhas in the Theravādin Tradition," in *Buddhist Studies in Honour of Walpola Rahula*, ed. S. Balasooriya et al (London/Bedford: 1980) 62-72.

XIV.4 A cliché.

XIV.5 *pradeśa*.

XIV.6 *krītva* = *nyos nas*. The occurrence here (and below) of the word "bought" can only highlight its curious omission in the account of the 'transaction' between Anāthapiṇḍada and Jeta above in the story of the 'present.'

XIV.7 Correct Gnoli's misprinted *pravraiya*. **Read**: *pravrajya*.

XIV.8 *tatsamparkād*. This is an unusual expression and there is some variation in the Tibetan: Tog has *des bstan pas*, but Derge and Peking *des bsten pas*, neither of which would seem to translate *samparka* altogether well.

XIV.9 *atyartham abhiprasannaḥ* = *shin tu dad pa skyes nas*. Here, too, however *abhiprasanna* is nuanced it results in donation.

XIV.10 *keśanakhastūpa* = *dbu skra dang sen mo'i mchod rten*. Feer long ago described such a *stūpa* as a "monument élevé à un Buddha de sont vivant et renfermant de ses reliques, rognures d'ongles et cheveux" (*Avadāna-çataka*, (Feer) 482). They are, in other words, monuments that contain parts of the body of a person who is still very much alive, parts, moreover, that are themselves particularly associated with continued growth — hair, nails, etc. That this class of objects could be legitimately called "relics" seems doubtful, and they would seem to require a different vocabulary and a fundamental rethinking of what their distribution means. Such a rethinking has yet

to be done in spite of the fact that reference to these objects as a focus of religious activity is extremely common in our *Vinaya* and its associated literature (for a small sample of references see G. Schopen, "An Old Inscription from *Amarāvatī* and the Cult of the Local Monastic Dead in Indian Buddhist Monasteries," *JIABS* 14.2 (1991) 320 n. 34 [=*BSBM* 196 n. 34] and n. 16 below).

XIV.11 Gnoli, 28 n. 2, says that Tibetan omits *divā ca*, but Tog, Derge, and Peking all have *nyin mtshan du*.

XIV.12 *tasyāntevasinā* = *de la rten pa*. *antevasinā* is, presumably, a misprint for *antevāsinā*, but even then this is a strange use of the term, especially for a *Vinaya* text, and it is not well supported by the Tibetan. *antevāsin* is usually translated by *nye gnas* or *slob ma*, both of which suggest "pupil," so if the Tibetan translators had a Sanskrit text which actually read *antevāsin* they too, by rendering it here as *rten pa*, must have understood that in this case the term meant something different than it usually does.

XIV.13 Gnoli reads *prāvṛtam*, but must have realized that this does not make for good sense, and adds in a note to it: "Omit in Tib. Read *prābhṛtam?*" Oddly enough the first part of this is wrong, but his uncertain suggestion is almost certainly right. Tog, Derge and Peking all have...*nor bu rin po che 'bar ba zhig skyes su bskur nas* (Peking alone and incorrectly has *bkur nas*), that is to say, all have *skyes* as a translation of what Gnoli prints as *prāvṛtam*. But not only does Jäschke give "present" for *skyes*, he cites a variant of our very phrase — *skyes skur ba*, "to give or send a present" — and *skyes* is an attested equivalent of *prābhṛta* (TSD 168). Read: *prābhṛtam*.

XIV.14 *caitye* — a notable instance of the interchangability of *stūpa* and *caitya* in virtually the same breath.

XIV.15 *-anubhāvāt* = *mthus*. See above II n. 18.

XIV.16 Here too Gnoli says that the Tibetan omits *divā*, but Tog, Derge and Peking all have *nyin mtshan du*.

It is worth noting, however briefly, that references to the illumination of these *stūpas*, and to worship of them at night, are common. Both are found, for example, in two of the most interesting texts dealing with *keśanakhastūpas*. In the *Uttaragrantha*, after Anāthapiṇḍada has gotten authorization to build such a *stūpa* and to plaster it, he goes to the Buddha and says: "Blessed One, although after I plastered the *stūpa* .... I worshipped it with perfumes and incense and flowers, still, there being no oil lamps at night (*mtshan mo*), it is not beautiful (*mi mdzas pa*) ...;" and the Buddha responds: "Therefore, Householder, since I order it, you now while worshipping must at night light a garland of oil lamps on the *stūpa* of hair and nails" (*de lta bas na khyim bdag ngas rjes su gnang gis de la mchod pa gyis te / nub mo dbu skra dang sen mo'i mchod rten gyi steng du mar me'i phreng ba bus shig;* Derge Pa 114a.3ff). Also in the *Uttaragrantha*, in what is almost certainly the original version of the *Śrīmatī Avadāna* which now forms Tale no. 54 in the Sanskrit *Avadānaśataka*, and where a *keśanakhastūpa* is established in the women's quarters (*antaḥpure*) of King Bimbisāra, it is a garland of lamps (*dīpamālā*) that Śrīmatī makes at the *keśanakha-stūpa*, and their illumination at night

which gets her into trouble with Ajātaśatru who had forbidden that the *stūpa* be worshipped (Derge Pa 115b.1-119a.6; *Avadānaśataka* (Speyer) i 307.1-312.8). In fact, although it has rarely been noticed, our texts present a world in which much — if not most — activity at Buddhist monasteries took place at night, and for good practical reasons: most ordinary people had a life! In an interesting text in the *Vibhaṅga*, for example, a text in which the term *puṇya* = *bsod nams* is again used to indicate 'wealth' (see above I.7), those who are described as, literally, "those who live by the fruit of merit" (*bsod nams kyi 'bras bus 'tsho ba*), are able to hear the Dharma taught during the day. But when they ask "those who live by the fruit of labor" (*rtsol ba'i 'bras bus 'tsho ba*) why they too do not listen to the Dharma, the latter say: "Since you are those who live by the fruit of merit [i.e. don't have to work for a living] you can listen to Dharma during the day. But since we are those who live by the fruit of labor, if we did not work during the day we would starve and die." When the Buddha hears of this he orders the monks: "Dharma must be taught at night!" (*mtshan mo chos bstan par bya'o* — Derge Ja 203a.3ff). And in yet another *Vibhaṅga* text thieves who plan on robbing a *vihāra* plan to do it when the monks "have the recitation of Dharma at night" (*de dag mtshan mo chos nyan pa de'i tshe*), and when the thieves come and pound on the door at night the monks inadvertently let them in thinking "since, surely, a group of people from the hamlet has come for the recitation of Dharma, we must open the door!" (Derge Ca 156a.5ff). The *Kṣudrakavastu* (Derge Tha 161b.4) repeats the Buddha's order concerning recitation of the Dharma at night, and has him further instruct the monks to light a lamp to keep snakes away, and, in summer, to construct a shade for it so insects do not fly into its flame. There are in fact many more indications of night time activities in monasteries which need to be more fully studied — how this fits with passages in non-buddhist sources which seem to indicate that movement at night was seriously restricted (see above VI n. 14) also needs to be determined.

XIV.17 *prasādajātena* = *dad pa skyes te.*

XIV.18 *praṇidhāna* = *smon lam.* Such vows are extremely common in our *Vinaya* (see below XV for another example) and its related literature, but little work appears to have been done on them; see S. Hiraoka, "A Classification of the Two Types of Vows (*praṇidhāna*) in Buddhist Texts — An Application to the Case of the *Divyāvadāna*," *Shūkyō Kenkyū* 66.2 (1992) 327-46 [in Japanese, with English summary].

XIV.19 *krītvā* = *nyos nas.*

XIV.20 Notice that a word for "bought" does not occur in the Sanskrit, though the Tibetan has one: ...*bzhin du / bdag gis kyang sa phyogs 'di gser dang dbyigs gshibs pas rgyal bu gzhon nu las nyos nas/.*

XIV.21 *kośān*, an odd usage and one not supported by the Tibetan which has *dpag tshad*. *dpag tshad* seems almost exclusively to translate *yojana*, but that would be a radical emendation. Since both syntax and context suggest some measure of distance, **Read:** *krośān*, even though *krośa* is twice translated below by *rgyang grags.*

XIV.22Here *niṣkrīya* (ms. — according to Gnoli — *niṣkrayaḥ*) = *nyos nas.*

XIV.23*paṭṭi* = *gos.* No further specification of the kind of cloth is given. Though it is not possible to take up the question here, there are good reasons for thinking that 'cloth' — a variety of terms are used — was for our *Vinaya* a recognized medium of exchange or a kind of currency.

XIV.24Gnoli reads *viṃśatisahasraparivāraḥ*, but the Tibetan has *'khor dge slong nyi khri.* The latter, together with the fact that up until this point everywhere else in these formulaic paragraphs the corresponding compounds have *-bhikṣu-* as one member, would seem to suggest that it has inadvertently dropped out here. In spite of the fact that *-bhikṣu-* is also omitted in the following paragraph (see n. 27 below), here **Read:** *viṃśatibhikṣusahasraparivāraḥ*.

XIV.25Gnoli prints *ardhakrośam sauvarṇair yavair āstīrya*, but notes that this is "ex conject. from Tib. *rgyang grags phyed gser kyis bkram pas*," and he gives the ms. reading as *navakroṣo sauvarṇair yavair āstīrya.* The Tibetan itself, however, shows significant variation — while Tog has the same reading as that cited by Gnoli, both Derge and Peking have *rgyang grags phyed gser gyi nas bkram pas*, i.e. they both translate *yava* — so it can not safely serve as the basis of an emendation. It would seem preferable to assume that the Sanskrit text used by the Tibetan translators had a different reading here, and to emend the ms. reading less radically to **Read:** *navakrośām sauvarṇair* etc.

XIV.26Here the Tibetan also does not have *-bhikṣu-*.

XIV.27Gnoli reads *ṣoḍaśalāṅgalāvaktākoṭai saṃstareṇa*, but notes that "the expression is obscure and perhaps corrupted." He cites the Tibetan as *rmon pa dor bcu drug gis smos pa'i khyon phye ba gshib pas*, and although this might be what Lhasa has, Tog, Derge and Peking read *rmon pa dor bcu drug gis rmos pa'i khyon bye ba gshib pas gshibs nas*, which is certainly to be preferred and may be translated "having covered with a covering of ten million *(koṭi)* the extent which is plowed with sixteen pair of oxen." To judge by the reading *koṭīsaṃstareṇa saṃstīrya* found below at 33.9, *-koṭai* here should probably read as *koṭī* and compounded not with what preceeds it, but with the following *saṃstareṇa*; and judging by the Tibetan found in Tog, etc., *-laṅgalāvakta-* might have been intended for something like *-lāṅgalakṛṣṭam*. Although a radical emendation, tentatively **Read:** *ṣoḍaśalāṅgalakṛṣṭam koṭīsaṃstareṇa saṃstīrya.*

XIV.28*niṣkrīya* = *nyos te.*

XIV.29This whole section dealing with the past, present, and future Buddhas looks, even on the surface, to be not particularly well integrated into the main account here, and the same is true of the next section as well (XV). But if XIV is an 'addition,' the language of the paragraph dealing with the 'present' Buddha in particular may well indicate that it at least is not late. It is probably better to think of at least the paragraph dealing with Śākyamuni as simply a separate, independent tradition. It clearly has too many distinct elements to have been closely related to the account in VIII above: there is in the account at VIII only a passing reference to a "layer of ten million" (*koṭisaṃstara*) which is a

key element of the statement here and is, apparently, old — it is found already in the Bharhut label (*jetavana anādhapeḍiko deti koṭisaṃthatena ketā* — see above IV n. 1; it will also, curiously, occur below in XVI); there is no reference at all in the preceeding account to the extent of the land being that which one can plow by "a team of sixteen" (for some comparatively late Sri Lankan references to marking the boundaries of land to be given for a *vihāra* by plowing it see S. Paranavitana, "Ploughing as a Ritual of Royal Consecration in Ancient Ceylon," *R.C. Majumdar Felicitation Volume*, ed. H.B. Sarkar (Calcutta: 1970) 31-39); and the main account carefully avoids — it seems — explicit reference to the word "bought," which is found both here and in the Bharhut label.

XIV.30 *ṣaṇṇavatyarhatkoṭīsahasraparivāra*. This even more than usually fantastic number is hard to get into English and gave the Tibetan translators some problems as well: *'khor dgra bcom pa khrag khrig phrag dgu dang / ther 'bum chen po phrag drug*. Something like it — *ṣaṇṇavatikoṭyo 'rhatāṃ bhaviṣyati* — occurs in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* in its account of Maitreya's future revelation of the Monk Kāśyapa's intact but tiny body in the Gurupādaka Mountain (Derge Kha 32b.2ff = *Divyāvadāna* 61.19ff — where *Divyāvadāna* 61.20 has *'śītibhikṣukoṭivāro*, the Tibetan has *'khor dge slong 'bum phrag dgu bcu rtsa drug*). The figure of Maitreya seems not to have had a significant role in our *Vinaya*, however, and there are very few references to him. The *Maitreyavyākaraṇa*, found both at Gilgit and in the Kanjur, may, by presumption, be Mūlasarvāstivādin, but Maitreya may be a figure who is more commonly referred to in modern scholarly literature than in the Indian Buddhist sources themselves; see J. Nattier, "The Meanings of the Maitreya Myth: A Typological Analysis," in *Maitreya, the Future Buddha*, ed. A. Sponberg & H. Hardacre (Cambridge: 1988) 23-47.

XV

XV.1 Like XIV, this section seems not to have been well integrated into the main account and would perhaps have fit more naturally at the end of IV above. Anāthapiṇḍada's ability to see hoards is also referred to independently elsewhere, at *Avadānaśataka* (Speyer) i 314-15, for example, when Anāthapiṇḍada undertakes "a general collection of alms" (*chandaka-bhikṣaṇa*) a poor woman asks a lay brother: *yadi tāvad ayaṃ gṛhapatir āḍhyo mahādhano mahābhogo 'ntar[bhūmau] nigūḍhāny api nidhānāni paśyati kasmād ayaṃ parakulebhyo bhaikṣyam aṭatīti*, "But if this householder is so rich, wealthy, and well off, and can even see hoards buried in the ground, why does he wander around begging from other families?"

Note too that although sadly under appreciated, there is a good deal of humor in Indian Buddhist literature and, in particular, in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Sylvain Lévi noticed this (see his remarks quoted in the Introduction), and it is important to note that without some appreciation for the sometimes sly, sometimes slapstick, humor that can be woven into these stories, the little tale that follows here might not make very much sense — it is, after all, a tale about a brahmin trying to peek at Anāthapiṇḍada when he is naked and still not understanding that he cannot, in any case, see what he is looking for.

XV.2 This has already explicitly been said above in IV, and yet is delivered here as if it were news.

XV.3 *caraka* = *spyod pa pa*. *BHSD* s.v. says no more than "one of a heretical sect of ascetics."

XV.4 *kutūhalaśālā* = *rtogs khang*. *BHSD* s.v. gives "hall of discussion" and notes that it is ordinarily used of gatherings of non-Buddhists." But *kutūhala* seems to mean above all else "curiosity, interest in any extraordinary matter," (see above IX n. 16) the implication being that any talk about it was idle gossip and there is, of course, no *kutūhalaśālā* for Buddhist monks — they have *upasthānaśālā* (see above I n. 2).

XV.5 *lakṣaṇena*, but in Tibetan it is translated as plural: *mtshan gang dag [dang] ldan na*. A reader of this *Vinaya* would have recognized immediately that the question was misconceived or even silly — such powers are there not the result of a physical mark or somatic characteristic, but they, and any physical mark as well, are the result of former religious acts (see, for example, the explanation for why Nanda, the Buddha's half-brother, had a golden body and thirty of the thirty-two marks of the Great Man and was therefore hard to distinguish from the Buddha himself — *Kṣudraka*, Derge Tha 153a.2ff; it was incidentally to avoid any such confusion that the Buddha ordered that monastic robes must be marked with an "insignia" (*mtshan ma*) that would show their wearer's rank (Tha 162b.7); or the repeated descriptions of the Buddha's hand as *cakrasvastikanandyāvartenānekapuṇyaśatanirjātena*, "with a hand marked with a wheel, a swastika, a *nandi*, and a spiral produced by many hundreds of merits;" *Cīvaravastu*, GMs iii 2, 129.12; *Saṅghabhedavastu* ii 188.25; etc).

XV.6 Although bathing in modern India does not necessarily involve total nakedness, there are good indications in our *Vinaya* that it commonly did in the India of its day (see, for example, *Cīvaravastu*, GMs iii 2, 85.14 where a servant girl sent by Viśākhā sees the monks bathing naked (*tayā bhikṣavo dṛṣṭā nagnāḥ snātum*), and the resulting requirement that they, at least, use "bathing clothes"). Upagu is therefore being presented here as a kind of Peeping Tom following Anāthapiṇḍada around trying to see him naked — a tongue in cheek representation of brahmanical behavior!

XV.7 *tasya tena pṛṣṭhena talaprahāro dattaḥ* = *des de'i rgyab tu thal mos brgyab pa dang /*. Neither the Sanskrit nor Tibetan is necessarily difficult to translate, but what such a gesture or action meant culturally is a different matter. I have not come across this action elsewhere in our *Vinaya* or in other Indian sources and so am without other contexts for guidance. It could mean something like it does, or can, in modern America: to show an artificial or disingenuous comaraderie or sense of acquaintance. This, however, could be wrong; and Phyllis Granoff has ingenuously suggested to me that the text is saying that Upagu "tapped him on the back" so that Anāthapiṇḍada would turn around and he could see his private parts — this seems more than a little plausible! See also below n.9.

XV.8 *kṣāntisauratyasamanvāgataḥ* = *bzod pa dang des pa dang ldan pa*. Upagu could hardly have learned this by seeing Anāthapiṇḍada naked, and since neither patience nor gentleness are "physical marks," his statement — given the context — makes no sense at all. This, however, is almost certainly the point, and it is driven home by the additional fact that, as the text will immediately add, non-buddhist religious not only believed this nonsense, but spread it about; but see also next note.

XV.9 *ratnacitrāntakośa* = *mig gi 'bras bu rin po che ltar bkra ba; hiraṇyeśvara* = *dbyig kyi skad.* There are problems with both of these *lakṣaṇas,* and several ways of interpreting the situation. As read by Gnoli — and repeatedly so — the first should mean "having a magnificent private treasury of jewels (and even this may require taking *-ānta-* as intended for *-antaḥ-*, though the former can also mean "inside")," and the second, "the lord of gold," but neither then would be "physical or bodily marks," neither would correspond very well with the account of the "vow" which follows and purportedly explains them, and both would be unsupported by the Tibetan. This may suggest either that Gnoli has misread the ms. — and repeatedly so — or that the ms. itself is corrupt, and extensively so. The Tibetan for the first would have to be translated as "having an eye (or pupil) variegated like a jewel," and for the second — *dbyig gi skad* — "having a voice of (like) gold (or wealth)." Both then would be physical characteristics; both — but especially the second — would correspond to the account of the vow that produced them; and from both it is not impossible to at least interpret the Sanskrit. The Tibetan *dbyig gi skad* would, for example, point to the need to emend *hiraṇyeśvara* to *hiraṇyasvara,* and this is not a radical emendation. *ratnacitrāntakośa,* though, requires something a bit more acrobatic. It would seem to require, in addition to understanding *-ānta-* in the sense of *antar,* either that *-kośa* is an abbreviated nominal compound for *netra-kośa,* "eye-ball," or that *netra-* (or something like it) has dropped out of the ms. Finally, it is also possible that the Sanskrit as read and printed by Gnoli is correct and that it then involves some fairly wild punning or word-play which the Tibetan was forced to reduce. Given the uncertainties and possibilities, and in the absence of further manuscript material or parallels (the Pāli tradition, for example, seems to know nothing about these "characteristics" of Anāthapiṇḍada), I have basically followed the Tibetan here, but with no strong conviction, although I have also factored in the Sanskrit *-anta-/-antar-* because of the possible parallel noted below in n.18. Note too that P. Granoff has once again suggested to me that the two expressions, however they finally be read, refer to Anāthapiṇḍada's balls and penis, and there are some reasons for thinking this so — *antakośa,* for example, could well be a pun on *aṇḍakośa,* and such things could well have been associated with "jewels" in early India, as in America (e.g. "family jewels"); etc. If this is the case that would explain the obscurity of the text which may well contain a joke that turns on a series of puns and double entendres that I, at least, cannot successfully untangle.

XV.10 From here to the end of the verse is a cliché which occurs, for example, in more than fifty of the individual texts in the *Avadānaśataka;* see *Avadāna-çataka* (Feer) 6 and n. 2.

XV.11 Another cliché; see above IV and n. 3 there.

XV.12 Still another cliché.

XV.13 Here yet another cliché occurs — as it frequently does — as an 'editorial insertion' explaining how it is that in this case honor and veneration is shown to someone other than a known Buddha. For another example — one which occurs in a narrative which, in outline, is almost identical to the one we have here and is made up of most of the same clichés — see the account in the *Kṣudrakavastu*

of the former acts of Nanda which resulted in his having thirty of the thirty-two marks of a Great Man (see above n. 5 and Derge Tha 156a.1ff).

I have translated *pratyekabuddha* as "solitary Buddha," though aware that there are other possibilities.

XV.14 *prasādajāta* = *dad pa skyes te*. Here *prasāda* is closely associated with *saumanasya*, "delight." In fact the Tibetan puts them cheek by jowl: *des thos nas de yid dga' bar gyur cing dad pa skyes te*, and to judge by Gnoli's note (32 n.1) — which is hard to interpret — that may have been the case in the ms. as well. Given Gnoli's note, the text here remains unsure.

XV.15 *taddarśanāya saṃprasthitaḥ*. This clause is not translated in the Tibetan. For *darśan* elsewhere in our text see II n. 21 and VI n. 8 above.

XV.16 *parinirvṛta*.

XV.17 *tāny asthīni sphaṭikamaye kumbhe ratnair vyāmiśrya prakṣiptāni* = *rus pa de rnams shel las byas ba'i bum pa'i nang du rin po che dang bsres te blugs pa:* This passage is of considerable interest because it is one of the very rare references in Buddhist literary sources to what is, in effect, a crystal 'reliquary,' and to the deposition of precious substances together with post-cremational remains, both of which are, in turn, not infrequently found in the archeological record (for some good illustrations of early crystal 'reliquaries' see M. Willis, *Buddhist Reliquaries from Ancient India* (London: 2000) figs 88, 98, 103, 105, 110; for a survey of the kinds of precious substances found in 'relic' deposits see A. Ghosh, ed., *An Encyclopaedia of Indian Archaeology* (New Delhi: 1989) Vol. I, 270-75.

The reference to extinguishing the pyre with milk (*kṣīra*) is also found elsewhere — see, for example, the text in the *Kṣudrakavastu* referred to in n. 13 above; or the account of the death and cremation of the Monk Kālodayin from the *Vibhaṅga* translated in Schopen, "Ritual, Rites and Bones of Contention," 35.

XV.18 *tāny antaḥsthāny*, there is no word for pot. Notice, though, that the bones then shine "inside" (*antar*) the pot, like Anāthapiṇḍada's "inner" eye (*-ānta[rnetra]kośa*) — this possible parallelism might add some support to the interpretations suggested above for *ratnacitrāntakośa*, although they remain very shaky.

XV.19 *pādayor nipatya* = *drung du gtugs nas*. If the Tibetan was translating the same Sanskrit it can only be considered a free rendering. This same curious, 'anthropomorphic,' idiom — with the same explicitly dual form — is also applied to *stūpas*; see *Adhikaraṇavastu* 70.12 (*pādayor nipatya* is here also translated by *drung du gtugs te* — Derge Ga 229b.7); *Saṅghabhedavastu* i 161.25 (where it is translated as *drung du btud des* — Derge Nga 75b.7); but also *Vibhaṅga* Nya 66a.3, where *rkang pa gnyis la phyag 'tshal nas* occurs. Notice that at *Śayanāsana* 8.14 (= II above) the same idiom is used to describe what a king does when he approaches a revered *Ṛṣi*, and at 22.8 (=IX above) to describe what the Renunciant Raktākṣa does when he takes refuge with Śāriputra.

XV.20*kārāṃ kṛtvā* = *bya ba byas nas.*

XV.21The very large place that relics, *stūpas*, and veneration of them played in the religious 'biographies' of both Buddhist lay brothers and sisters is nicely exemplified here in this account of Anāthapiṇḍada. But it is important to note that the same pattern occurs in, for example, the religious biographies of Buddhist monks — at least as they are presented in Mūlasarvāstivādin sources; see M. Hofinger, *Le congrès du lac anavatapta* (*Vies de saints bouddhiques*) (Louvain: 1954).

XV.22The whole of this exhortation explicitly addressed to monks is a cliché and, as already noted, it is perfectly fitted to and characteristic of *Vinaya* literature. The fact that it also occurs in, for example, almost half of the *avadānas* in the *Avadānaśataka* would seem to confirm that such collections should also be considered *Vinaya* texts; see *Avadāna-çataka* (Feer) 3, and II ns. 27 and 35 above.

XV.23This *antaroddāna*, like the *uddāna* at the head of our text and the various *uddānas* that will occur below, will be treated in an appendix to Part II of this translation. In this particular instance although the key word-index comes after XV it summarizes XIV and makes no reference to the former.